

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHILE all who realize the horror of modern warfare must share the sense of relief that the immediate danger was averted and must appreciate the persistent and strenuous efforts of the British Prime Minister to this end, there must also be differences of conviction regarding the price paid for the peace, and the prospect that the settlement offers of a permanent appeasement of national antagonisms. To the Czecho-Slovakian people profound sympathy is due in the sacrifice inflicted upon it, and, in all ways open, succour and support to it in its trial and need must be regarded as a debt. Few can feel content with the results, and the best any can plead is that the lesser of two evils has been chosen. If in the situation that was the only choice possible, all the more must many feel sorrow and shame that the peace-making involved pledge-breaking, and that none can boast of a peace with honour. There cannot be many, however, who will dare to say that war was to be preferred. How great is the mystery of iniquity, and how tragic its consequences!

Whether this relief is only a temporary respite or a permanent release from the haunting terror of a world-war depends on a number of factors it is impossible with certainty to determine. The prestige of the dictators has been raised, their support at home strengthened and their influence abroad widened. Will their ambition and arrogance be increased, and will they continue to make demands, which will be ever renewing the peril of

war? Or will the evidence in Germany and Italy during the crisis of the people's dread of war and desire for peace, the world-wide opposition to war among other nations, and the preparations made by some for resistance if need be, serve as a restraint on the policy of violence, and as a constraint to secure the ends desired by negotiations?

The problems to be solved in Europe, if its peace is to be assured, are many; and while there are demands which must be refused lest righteousness be sacrificed to violence, yet there should be on our part a readiness to recognize the justice of such claims as may involve a sacrifice of interests, but not of principles. As regards colonies, for instance, the natives have a prior claim for consideration. It is in the economic sphere that there seems to lie the widest possibility of accommodation, even if there is ground for the suspicion that national ambition is disguised as economic necessity. The spirit of conciliation must be allowed to prevail over the prejudice and the hostility which the policy of the dictators naturally provokes. No statesman would be justified in invoking 'the dread arbitrament of war' unless he had done everything that can be done not only righteously but even generously to promote peace. There is at least the possibility that such an approach would, from whatever motives, find a response.

Much as the profession and the practice of the dictators deserve condemnation from any moral,

not to say Christian standpoint, war-guilt would not be theirs alone ; for all the nations are involved in one condemnation. The last war was fought by many in the belief that it was to end war. An opportunity was given to the victorious Powers to make a fresh start in international relations. A few pleaded that a peace of magnanimity, and not of vengeance, should be attempted. But in vain. The post-War treatment of Germany was such as to increase hatred and the resolve of revenge, although there were in Germany many Christian leaders ready to respond to a policy of reconciliation. The League of Nations was formed as an international organ to promote peace, but some of the nations pursued a national policy provocative of war. And at first the victorious Powers used the League to preserve the unjust *status quo*. The treatment of minorities has in some cases been very bad, and the League did not exercise its influence as it should have done to redress grievances. In history there is the inexorable law : ' Be not deceived, God is not mocked : for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' Are we reaping to-day what has been sown ?

If there is to be any better future for Europe and not growing disaster, there must be a return to the ways of God.

The Christian Challenge Series has produced a number of excellent little handbooks, but nothing better than the most recent volume issued, on *Christian Moral Conduct*, by the Rev. A. E. GARVIE, D.D. (The Unicorn Press ; 3s. 6d. net). Dr. GARVIE is too well known as a great religious thinker to need commendation, and doubtless many who have not read his larger works will be glad to have the substance of his thinking in this small book. It is at once profound, clear, and comprehensive.

He insists on the intimate connexion of faith and works, religion and morality. Christian morality is inseparable from Christian faith. They were gravely mistaken who in the last generation imagined that the edifice of Christian morality

could be maintained when the substructure of Christian faith was removed. Time has speedily shown the folly of that expectation. Once the foundation of Christian doctrine was undermined it was not long before the attack was directed against Christian morality. It is only on the basis of Christian truth that Christian standards of conduct can be upheld. The life of love which is the essence of Christian morality draws its motive from the divine love as revealed in Christ, and finds its enabling power in His Holy Spirit.

This view runs counter to the common assumption that man has a sufficiency in himself to attain and live the good life apart from the grace of God. ' Morality assumes that what man *ought* to do he *can* do, that his freedom matches his duty.' This is a profound error, as men discover when they set themselves seriously to do the good. Then are they constrained to make the sad confession, with St. Paul, ' the good that I would I do not, but the evil that I would not, that I do.' The standard of common decency and morality to which we are accustomed is not the simple product of the natural goodness of man's heart as many suppose. On the contrary, it is the fruit of centuries of Christian doctrine and discipline without which it would speedily wither away. ' This natural goodness in the community which for generations has been under Christian influences cannot be regarded as altogether detached from the divine grace mediated by human lives ; and it may be doubted whether apart from such influences the Christian standard at its best would have been recognized, or at its best realized.'

Dr. GARVIE raises the question, What is Christian morality ? Is it in any wise different from ordinary morality ? Has it a distinctive quality of its own ? This is a question which is frequently overlooked. Books on Christian ethics have been written which do not differ greatly from other books on ethics. In them the cardinal virtues are discussed after the manner of the Greek philosophers, and then perhaps, by way of addendum, something is said about the Christian graces. Christian morality is not presented as an organic whole, rooted in Christian

truth, and drawing its vitality from Christian faith.

In order to determine what is distinctive in Christian morality we must for one thing understand the governing concept of the Kingdom of God. 'The Kingdom of God, the term so often on the lips of Jesus, is not primarily an ideal of human society to be realized by human effort with the help of God; it is God's sovereign activity in human history, of which such a society should be the result if men in all their aspiration and endeavour will depend on and submit to that activity. It is God's *rule* to form God's *realm*.' This Kingdom comes through the agency of God's Word, which is a dynamic Word, effecting what it declares. It is not in word only, but in deed and in power. God acts and suffers as well as speaks through the Incarnate Word. 'It is an unhistorical restriction of the Word of God in Christ to limit it to the teaching and example of Jesus, and to exclude the activity of God in the living Christ and the Holy Spirit, as experienced in the primitive church, and as evidenced and interpreted in the New Testament.' The Kingdom of God as presented in the New Testament is 'a *saving sovereignty* in divine passion as well as action.' It is not individual only, but also social. The first company of Jesus' disciples became the nucleus of the primitive Christian community, and the Church throughout history has been both the object and the organ of divine grace, the recipient that it might become the agent of the saving sovereignty. 'All these terms—Kingdom (a rule involves a realm), *ekklesia* (the called assembly), and Son of Man, present the dynamic Word of God as creative of a community, and of individuals as members of it. Thus Christian morality has necessarily reference to the divine purpose for human society.'

Another great concept which governs Christian morality and gives it its distinctive quality is the concept of grace as revealed in the redemption which is in Christ. 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is the love of God bearing man's burden, sharing man's sorrow, making man's life and death its own concern.' The deepest meaning of the

Incarnation is that the Son of God was identifying Himself with mankind. His death was the consummation of His life as the self-sacrifice of vicarious love. This grace calls for the response of faith, which is 'man's self-identification with God in dependence, submission, and devotion. This Paul describes as being crucified and risen with Christ.'

In the light of these governing concepts it becomes apparent that Christian moral conduct does not consist in obedience to a divine law, but is a participation through love in God's saving activity in Christ. 'Moral conduct is *Christian* when it is in accordance with and advances the Kingdom of God, His redeeming and reconciling purpose in Christ; and not necessarily so when it conforms to the precept or example of Jesus, or any Scripture precedent.' The law of love to God and man is for the Christian not, strictly speaking, a law at all, in the sense of an outward commandment carrying rewards and penalties. 'It is more like a *natural* law, which is a description of what natural processes *are*, not an injunction what they *ought* to be.' This is Luther's 'liberty of the Christian man.' This is what Augustine meant when he said, 'Love God and do what you like.'

In this spirit of love the Christian seeks his neighbour's good. What that good consists in must be determined by what is God's will for both. 'God desires all men to be redeemed from sin, reconciled unto Himself, renewed by His Spirit in holiness, and so fitted for the eternal life in heaven. Love for self is the gradual conforming of the imperfect self to that ideal self. Love for a neighbour is doing all possible to enable another to be also so conformed.'

This love and desire to promote a neighbour's well-being will include a real concern for his physical and social good. Necessarily so, for the greater includes the less. 'The Golden Rule is a limitation set on selfishness, not a limit to generosity. He who truly loves will not measure his obligations to others by his expectations from them, but he will give more than he hopes to get.' It will also include, what is far harder, forgiveness. 'Forgiveness is

the gift of love which costs most, and that gift comes to sinful mankind in the Cross of Christ.' 'Love must always be ready to take the initiative, but the forgiveness is not effective until he who needs to be forgiven has recognized, repented of, renounced and confessed his sin, in response to such an initiative. Love will not wait in cold aloofness until forgiveness is sought, but offers the forgiveness that it may be sought. God's grace in Christ anticipates man's faith, but becomes effective only through faith.'

The application of Christian principles in particular cases must be made the subject of constant and careful study. How far shall a man sacrifice himself in the service of others? How best is the neighbour's good to be promoted? 'One cannot but wonder whether the community is not doing too much for some men to allow them the full development of their manhood as God wills it should be. While these warnings may be necessary for some Christian men, it is to be feared that the majority need to be made to realize that the Christian life is, because Christ-like, God-like, a life of self-emptying, self-humbling, self-giving in order that God's saving activity may be made manifest, and His Kingdom may come.'

It must not be lightly assumed, as it is by many, that Christian love in forgiveness excludes all resistance of evil and demands submission to any wrong. Love does not annul, but fulfils law. Love may need to smite that it may save, to be severe that it may be kind. But 'this retributive method must always be subordinate to the redemptive purpose of God. Accordingly, resistance to wrong is only justified if forgiveness and sacrifice are being constantly exercised.'

Early this year there was published 'Doctrine in the Church of England,' as the long-awaited Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922. The Report took cognizance of liberal views, in particular on the Doctrines of the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection of

Christ, while sounding in general the note of conservative theology. And it was welcomed on the whole by theologians so diverse in standpoint as Dr. N. P. Williams and Dr. H. D. A. Major.

Much has been written about the contents of the Report. It has even been affirmed that the Report leaves people free to believe or reject almost any article of the Christian Creed. This stirred up the Bishop of London to write a little book for laymen in which he pointed out that the Report has to do with Doctrine *in* the Church of England, and is not an exposition of the Doctrine *of* the Church of England. There he also proceeded to criticise certain points in the Report and to set forth in a popular way and from a conservative standpoint the traditional Anglican positions (as stated in the Prayer Book, the Creeds, and to a lesser degree the Articles).

More recently another conservative exposition of Anglican Doctrine has appeared. The writer of it is the Rev. R. S. T. HASLEHURST, B.D., Vice Chancellor of Chichester Cathedral; and his aim has been both to expound the Report and to provide a manual for study circles. The work is published in two paper-covered volumes (which may be obtained separately for 2s. each) under the title *Church of England Doctrine* (Part I., 'God and Redemption'; Part II., 'The Church and Sacraments and Eschatology'). The publishers are the S.P.C.K., and the volumes belong to the publishers' series of Educational Books.

Mr. HASLEHURST has succeeded admirably in his twofold aim. Taking the latter aim first, we note that he sets questions for study circles on each of his twelve chapters, and follows this up with a list of books and pamphlets, at once scholarly and cheap, for further study. We are inclined to think, however, that a more systematic book on Christian Doctrine is preferable in study circles to one which is of the nature of a 'companion' to a Report.

As for his expository aim, he is, as already said, on the side of traditional theology. Yet a perusal

of his book shows that he is alive to modern positions and no partisan of a one-sided Anglicanism. The book has also the merit of amplifying in popular terms and with simple illustrations (some of which may, however, offend some minds) the doctrinal statements of the Report.

Let us give his views on certain points. He would retain the Thirty-nine Articles in their present form, even though they represent the mind of the Church of England on matters which were much debated in the sixteenth century, but which are, in some cases, of purely academic interest to-day. His reason is that they were worded so as to be 'comprehensive,' in the sense of keeping wide the door of a National Church, and that it is better they should receive a 'general assent' from the clergy than that new and more up-to-date, but more constrictive, formularies should be devised.

On the subject of miracles he adopts the newer standpoint in Christian Apologetics, not the standpoint of the 'Evidential School,' who found evidence in miracles of the truth of Christianity: 'It is not miraculous that the world's great Miracle should have wrought miracles. It would rather have been miraculous had He not done so. Yet He was not miraculous because He did miraculous things: He did miraculous things because He was miraculous.'

On the subject of the Resurrection of Jesus the writer's orthodoxy is clearly expressed. But he is not unwilling to go out of his way to make a present to the liberal critics of a rationalistic theory. After reviewing rationalistic theories of the Empty Tomb he says that (if the miraculous were conceded to be impossible) a simple explanation would be that the earthquake on the Day of the Crucifixion may have caused a fissure into which our Lord's body disappeared, the tomb subsequently recovering its previous shape (more or less) and the stone rolling away.

There is a modern tone in Mr. HASLEHURST'S insistence that belief in the Trinity is the result of

an experience, and its doctrine an attempt to put that experience into words. Let a man live the Christian life, he says, and share in the fellowship of those who live it, singing their hymns and praying their prayers, and he will generally come to find that the formulæ in which, however inadequately, they have tried to express their convictions are not barren and soulless abstractions, with no bearing on life and its problems, but verbal approximations to spiritual truths.

An exclusive or narrow use of the term 'Catholic' is deprecated: "Catholic" is not the opposite of "Protestant," as is proved by the fact that 1400 years lie between the births of the two words in their religious sense. The opposite of "Catholic" is "heretic," the opposite of "Protestant" is "papist." Deprecated also is 'devotions' before the Reserved Elements at a public service: 'A Bishop may consider that he has a right to go behind the Prayer Book and permit Reservation for the sick, on the ground that modern conditions, unforeseen in 1662, render it in some cases almost necessary to revert to what was the custom in the earliest days, but that it is a more serious matter if he permits what is of comparatively modern growth, and is taken from the usage of another communion.'

One other point. It is Mr. HASLEHURST'S opinion that without belief in some kind of purgatorial state Prayer for the Departed is redundant. If the departed are in perfect joy and felicity, they plainly do not need our prayers. The Church of England, however, permitted prayers for the departed during the war against Napoleon and again during the Boer war; but as such prayers are based on the conception that the soul passes through a further stage of development in the hereafter (a conception refuted by many 'Evangelicals'), it is better to leave them, unless in times of very general mourning, to the private devotions of individuals.

Hindus, in one of his best-known works, traces the collapse of Russia after the War, and the

triumph of Bolshevism, largely to the deadness of the Russian Orthodox Church. And this has become a commonplace. We have most of us had the idea that there was practically no religion in Russia except a kind of ritualism from which all vitality and reality had long since fled. One should perhaps suspect such generalizations. And certainly this one is far from reliable in view of the facts disclosed in a rather remarkable book on Russian life and religion just published—*The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought*, by Nadejda GORODETZKY, B.Litt. (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net).

The book is interesting because of the light it throws on the inner life of pre-War Russia, not only its religion and theology but its literature also. And the most interesting thing that emerges from the writer's review is that the key to all Russian thought and literature is to be found in one word, *kenosis*. We restrict this term to its theological application in the case of the self-emptying of Christ. But there is no such restriction in Russian thinking. It applies to life and literature as much as to the Person of Christ. 'Long before Russian thought was mature enough to face the doctrine of *kenosis*, the attention of the Russian people was struck by the evangelical call to meekness, poverty, humility, and obedience.' This type of character was widely represented whether in history, literature, or devotion. It is a constant feature in all forms of Russian thought. One of the most famous of its writers says that 'the exterior form of a slave in which we found our nation, the pitiful condition of Russia in economic and other domains, far from being a contradiction of her vocation, rather confirms it.'

Her vocation was to present to the world a kenotic type of life. The call of the highest free activities of the human spirit—thought, science, art, and so-called civilization—is to *serve* the gradual incarnation of the Christian ideal in human society. This ideal was taken from the Gospels and was regarded as having nothing to do with riches or power. Poverty was regarded with respect. Simplicity of life was the true aim. Luxury or

even comfort was felt to be an 'unlawfulness,' not only from the religious point of view but from the moral and social. 'A Russian respects the rags of a fool for Christ's sake more than the golden brocade of a courtier.'

Tolstoy was not the only one to take the gospel teaching at its face value. 'When a man is called of God, the evil of riches is then revealed' is a characteristic saying. Poverty and wealth are neutral in themselves, but wealth can be used according to Christianity only in one way: by complete distribution of it, not by exercises of charity. It is not Socialist theory that lies behind this, but the conviction that the absolute of Christ's Commandments creates the spirit of self-sacrifice which led Christ to His Cross. And so a Russian writer (Tareev) claims that, poor and insignificant as their literature is in history and philology and other sciences 'the problem of the very nature of Christianity is faced in its depth'; and that even their secular literature therefore is filled with compassion for the toiling and the humble.

Thus Russian life and literature were dominated by the kenotic ideal long before this thought came into theology. But into theology it did come. And the whole history of Christ as the Godman became inspired by the same idea. It was, of course, the very meaning of the Incarnation. This is a familiar field to us in the West. But a word or two may be spared for the Russian way of regarding it. The Incarnation was not due to man's sin. It was 'an original good will of God which existed before the creation of the world as its basis and aim.'

The Incarnation is not merely a *means* of redemption but its highest achievement. The goal of the divine purpose is to unite all the heavenly and the earthly world under one head, Christ. Russian theologians go into great detail as to the act of self-limiting which took place in the Incarnation. The theory of the two natures rules all their thinking, and it is pursued with great subtlety. The *kenosis* is not, however, a matter only of the act of God in Incarnation. It applies to all the

Lord's ministry, to His poverty and humility, but above all to His temptation and His utter obedience. The ideal for a true life, which had preceded reflection on the mysteries of the faith, found confirmation in the ministry of Jesus.

All the problems raised by the *kenosis* in the Incarnation occupied the Russian religious mind. But this is not the most interesting feature of their thinking about *kenosis*. They carried the idea up into the divine life itself. The pre-mundane *kenosis* consists of the mutual love of the divine hypostases. The Fatherhood is the image of love which does not desire to possess within and for Himself. It reveals His love in the spiritual begetting of the Son. This is a self-emptying which is at the same time a self-realization.

The Sonship is already an eternal *kenosis* in that the second hypostasis makes Himself the Word of the Father. He becomes poor and sacrificially silent in the bosom of the Father. If on the side of the Father there is self-negation in the begetting of the Son, the Son is emptying Himself when He accepts the passive state of the One who is begotten. This mutual sacrifice is not a tragedy because it

is overcome by the bliss and joy of this accepted mutual sacrifice. And, finally, the triumphant cognition and witness in God of Himself and His only-begotten Son is the procession of the Holy Ghost. The passive character of the procession is in harmony with the sacrificial kenotic love.

This survey is in accord with the purpose of these Notes, which is to give an account of what is going on in the world of religious thought. It is a matter of great interest to know that, so far from Russian religion before the War being dumb and lifeless, a very definite movement was at work, dominated by one idea, which appears not only in theology but in literature, in the works of men like Dostoevsky, the idea of *kenosis*. The idea was absorbed from the Gospels. But when reflection on it began to be made, it became the ruling and inspiring idea in theology. It explained creation, which was a kenotic act. It explained the coming, and also the whole ministry, of Jesus. And it explains the very nature of the inner life of the tri-une Deity. Much Russian theology seems abstract until we realize that what it is working with, and trying to understand, was something so real to these thinkers that it expressed their ideal for daily living.

Aldous Huxley—Cosmology and Ethic.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID CAIRNS, M.A., BRIDGE OF ALLAN.

ALDOUS HUXLEY has won the attention and the respect of the discerning public because his wit and his limpid style display to the best advantage a philosophy of life which cannot be ignored, and because his keen imagination has penetrated right to the heart of some of our problems of to-day. Perhaps his creative powers are not great, he has hardly given the world one striking or memorable character: it is often difficult even to remember the names of the men and women who saunter through his novels. Nor yet have these vigour of action or plot—many of them seem like one long house-party of desultory and sometimes brilliant talk, punctuated by amorous interludes and marked

by growing tedium. There is in his works little of that enthralling vitality and enjoyment of human character and action, that love of life and men, that exuberant laughter with them and at them that marks the greatest novels. How is it, then, that Huxley deserves the place which the modern world has given to him as a writer? The answer is that it is as an essayist and philosopher that he excels, even in his novels. In nearly all of them there appears at least one figure who is merely put there to express a point of view. Huxley has not much power of painting a character from outside, but he has an uncanny capacity for getting inside his characters, and seeing the world through their

eyes. Even in Lilian Aldwinkle, in *Those Barren Leaves*, you feel that it is Huxley in petticoats who speaks to you, though this prosperous, ridiculous, unsatisfied amorist is one of his most objective and objectionable creations.

His characters live in an atmosphere of culture and wealth, a world with every advantage save a definite discipline and goal. Hardly anything could be more different from Huxley's writings than a book like John Allan's *Farmer's Boy*—a story of working people on a Scottish farm, a story sometimes a little crude, but written with love, and rightly so, for these people are lovable in themselves. The gusto with which this book was written is in tremendous contrast to the depressing atmosphere of Huxley's novels, in which even beauty has lost its divinity. If Allan rightly loves the people of whom he writes, one might say that Huxley rightly hates the people he writes about. At any rate, his reaction of nausea is an eminently healthy one. And that is why his sexually unpleasant passages are not so corrupting in their tendency as they might be. There is far too much awareness of the hopeless slavery of such a life of unbridled freedom, and far too much of the headache of the morning after.

He has seen with penetrating clearness what some professional philosophers have not seen, that in a world, where the final realities are space-time patterns, there can be no sufficient reason why men should discipline themselves in the face of moral temptations, or should devote themselves to the pursuit of scientific truth or beauty. The result of such a cosmology of materialism will be, as it has always been, a growing ennui, which ends in complete disillusionment as to the value of anything. Spandrell, in *Point Counterpoint*, is a man who manages to get some thrill out of life so long as he can regard it as rebellion against God. But when the murder, which he and Illidge commit, disappoints him by giving him no sense of demonic grandeur, all the value of life disappears for him with the disappearance of the God against whom he is in rebellion. His last action, before going out to meet the revolvers of the Fascists whom he has summoned to take their revenge on him, is to invite Rampion and his wife to the house, in order to *prove* to them that there is a God by playing on his gramophone Beethoven's 'Hymn of Thanksgiving' in the quartet, Opus 132. Thus, if the materialist philosophy is right, even crime loses its point for the criminal, as does virtue lose its attraction for the saint. And that not because God punishes or rewards, but because the whole dignity of life

depends on the validity of moral issues. But if the materialist philosophy were true, men would be able to lose themselves in an amoral pursuit of pleasure and happiness. And this is precisely what Huxley's people are unable to do. How often they surprise themselves in the middle of some debauch by the appalling consideration that they cannot sink their humanity, cannot forget in the satisfactions of the moment the fact that there is a part of them which remains awake and is miserable! How ghastly is the picture of the mechanized State in *Brave New World*! How thoroughly we sympathize with the Savage, who, unable to escape, hangs himself from the landing of the staircase in his own house! And not only in this novel is the oppression of the atmosphere almost intolerable—most of Huxley's characters are living in hell, only the most of them do not at first realize it. It is probable that Huxley himself did not at first realize it, but now he sees that it is slavery at the mill in Gaza. And the recognition that it is this, is itself a proof that the image of God cannot be wholly obliterated from man, that therefore man is meant to live for other ends than gratification, that there is consequently a meaning and plan in the world. This might be called Huxley's argument from moral experience.

But there is also an argument to the same conclusion from æsthetic experience. In *Point Counterpoint* there is an account of a performance of music by Bach at the house of Lord Edward Tantamount. 'Pongileoni's blowing, and the scraping of the anonymous fiddlers had shaken the air in the great hall, had set the glass windows looking on to it vibrating, and this in turn had shaken the air in Lord Edward's apartment on the farther side. The shaking air had rattled Lord Edward's membrana tympani, the interlocked malleus, incus, and stirrup bones were set in motion so as to agitate the membrane of the oval window and raise an infinitesimal storm in the fluid of the labyrinth. The hairy endings of the auditory nerve shuddered like weeds in a rough sea, a vast number of obscure miracles were performed in the brain, and Lord Edward ecstatically whispered, "Bach!"' We see here at least a dawning incredulity as to whether the mechanical explanation of the way in which music is heard can tell us everything. Is there not, the writer seems to ask, some reality in the universe other than the space-time configurations, a reality about which the music of Bach seems to tell us?

Certainly Huxley saw, as long ago as *Those Barren Leaves*, that it was absurd to reject the claim that morality expressed more than individual

preference or social sanction, and yet to seek truth for truth's sake, or art for art's sake. There he makes Francis Chelifer write :

'Religion, patriotism, the moral order, humanitarianism, social reform—we have all of us, I imagine, dropped all these overboard long ago. But we still cling pathetically to art. Quite unreasonably ; for the thing has far less reason for existence than most of the objects that we have got rid of, is utterly senseless indeed, without their support and justification. Art for art's sake ; halma for halma's sake. It is time to smash the last and silliest of the idols. My friends, I adjure you, put away the ultimate and sweetest of the inebriants, and wake up at last completely sober—among the dustbins at the bottom of the area steps.'

In short, Huxley has made clear as no other writer of our time, that life is hopeless, pointless, and fatuous, unless there be a meaning in the universe itself. If science gives the complete account of reality as being nothing more than a space-time network, there remains no such thing as obligation or beauty, or in the end, truth ; and therewith science's claim to represent an objective reality falls to the ground.

The main aim of this article is to discuss the question whether the meaning that Huxley claims to find in the universe is itself a logically satisfactory one. Or does his own cosmology in the end break down, being unable to save life from meaninglessness ?

Although it is here impossible to trace the development by which his views have reached their present state, it is worth while quoting a very honest and significant passage in *Ends and Means*, which shows us that Huxley as a younger man accepted along with many of his contemporaries the 'Philosophy of Meaninglessness' for two reasons. He says, 'The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom ; we objected to the political and economic system because it was unjust. The supporters of these systems claimed that in some way they embodied the meaning, a Christian meaning, they insisted, of the world. There was one admirably simple method of confuting these people and at the same time justifying ourselves in our political and erotic revolt : we could deny that the world had any meaning whatsoever.' He goes on to say that 'By the end of the twenties a reaction against this

philosophy of meaninglessness had begun to set in—away from the easy-going philosophy of general meaninglessness towards the hard ferocious theologies of nationalistic and revolutionary idolatry.' Sickened equally by the results of the philosophy of meaninglessness, and by the poisonous fruits of the philosophies which 'reintroduced meaning to the world, but only in patches'—Huxley saw that only if the whole world had a meaning could human life have significance and dignity, only then could a real ethic be found and believed in.

Huxley's history has thus shown that a man's ethical beliefs cannot be considered as independent from his cosmology—his beliefs about the nature of the universe. In *Ends and Means* he suggests both an ethic and a cosmology. Now the question arises for us, What is the relation between the cosmology and the ethic of any particular thinker ? The answer is, that it ought to be, but is not always, a logical connexion. Each ethic presupposes a certain cosmology, and each cosmology implies a certain ethic. But men are not wholly logical—not even Huxley is wholly logical—and it is thus possible that a man may have an ethic which belongs to a quite different cosmology from that which he professes. The position here to be developed is that Huxley's ethic is very much nearer to the Christian standpoint than his cosmology, and therefore from our point of view very much better. It is, in short, an ethic which can only be valid if a theistic view of the universe is the right one. Huxley's cosmology, on the other hand, is by no means able to support his ethic, and it is only by means of erroneous arguments that he succeeds in seeming to connect them. Such a lack of acumen seems strange in one who is so acute a thinker, and it is probable that he will not long be able to remain in the position which he has taken up. For in spite of his modest disclaimer at the end of *Ends and Means*—'The knowledge and the abilities of the author are narrowly limited'—it is clear that he has both courage and insight enough to prevent him from being permanently blinded by prejudice.

Huxley's own ethic in brief is an ethic which sets high value upon disinterested love and awareness. But the word which he uses to describe his own ideal man and 'the ideal of the free philosophers, the mystics, the founders of religions' is 'non-attached.' 'Such a man is non-attached to his bodily sensations and lusts, to his craving for power and possessions, to his anger and hatred, his exclusive loves, to wealth, fame, and social position, non-attached even to science, art, speculation and

philanthropy.' This non-attachment has always been associated in the teachings of the philosophers and the founders of religions with attachment to an ultimate reality greater and more significant than the self, a spiritual reality underlying the phenomenal world, and imparting to it whatever value or significance it possesses. 'Non-attachment is negative only in name; the practice of non-attachment entails the practice of all the virtues, charity, courage, generosity, and disinterestedness.'

For nearly thirty centuries, says Huxley, there has existed a very general agreement about the ideal goal of human effort. From Isaiah to Karl Marx the prophets have looked forward to a golden age when there will be liberty, peace, justice, and brotherly love. Hitler and Mussolini and Nietzsche and the Marquis de Sade are among the few who do not agree as to this being the ideal goal or end of moral effort. But when it comes to the means to be taken to bring about this end, there is a tragic degree of dissension among moralists. Men who agree in hoping for a day when the lion will lie down with the lamb are found employing means employed by Nazism and Fascism. Communism, too, has its knuckle-dusters, its secret police, its militaristic education of the young, its concentration camps. Huxley's argument is that your means really control the nature of your ends. If you try to seek brotherhood by force, you will find that you achieve anything but brotherhood. Force and hatred breed force and hatred; big dung-beetles breed little dung-beetles.

Many of the most valuable pages of the book are given to discussing the best way to break the vicious circle of hatred and tyranny in which we find ourselves to-day. How are we to secure a world which respects human freedom, making individuals intelligent and responsible citizens of the world, and not mere mechanical dolls wound up and set going by a Totalitarian State Authority? It is not my plan to enter here into a discussion of the suggestions put forward in *Ends and Means* for attaining this result. But these proposals are eminently worth consideration and investigation.

Having referred to Huxley's ethic, let us go on to examine his cosmology, and the way in which he claims to derive his ethic from it. He believes in an impersonal and amoral Absolute. In the mystical experience we attain to union with this Absolute. Very little is said about the mystical experience. Huxley is confronted with the difficulty of showing how his ethic of love and non-violence can be deduced from his cosmology. This is the crucial

point in his book, where, in my opinion, the argument breaks down. The link by which he tries to join his cosmology to his ethics is this. Virtue is the essential preliminary to the mystical experience. 'God is not good, but if I want as full a knowledge of God as it is possible for human beings to have, I must be as good as it is possible for human beings to be.'

How can this position be justified? The argument runs as follows. The Universe is essentially one, but there are in it superficial diversities. Goodness is that which makes for unity; evil is that which makes for separateness. Separateness is attachment, attachment to the desires of sex, to ambition, to fear. If a man be attached to any one over-mastering desire or ambition, then he cannot realize the unity which lies beneath the diversity.

What are the weaknesses of the position? Firstly: Huxley, holding the cosmology which he does, has no logical right to define goodness as that which makes for unity. As a matter of experience we know that goodness does lead towards unity, while evil makes for separateness. But the facts of experience will not fit in with Huxley's cosmology, they point, in fact, to a quite different world view—to a theistic cosmology. Both we and Huxley would be agreed that real love is good, defining real love as that frame of mind in which I take responsibility for my neighbour, seek his good for his own sake, sink my interests in his. Sin is that which divides us from communion with each other. But this definition of love is only consistent with a cosmology which holds that God is good, that sin is a contradiction of His nature and consequently of our own, since we are created in His image.

But, of course, Huxley has not this theistic cosmology behind him, and so when he says that goodness makes for unity, he is really asserting something quite different from us. He has at the back of his mind a conception of reality as amoral, and therefore he is trying to define goodness in terms of something other than goodness—as that which makes for unity with an amoral reality. But there is no shadow of justification for such a definition. If the final reality is beyond good and evil it must be indifferent to goodness. But if it is indifferent to goodness it must be below it. In that case we are justified in asking why the saint is nearer than the libertine to a God to whom all moral issues are indifferent. Why should non-attachment to lust clear my eyes for the vision of such a God? Why should the mystical approach to unity with him not be through the unbridled release of the sex-instinct, or through a kind of

sex-mysticism like that of D. H. Lawrence? Huxley and his character Calamy have discovered that *as a matter of fact* the way to God does not lie in this direction. Let them build upon this discovery and find out what are its cosmological implications. They are agreed on the fact that 'Only the pure in heart shall see God.' The inference must be that God is purer than man, and that impurity blinds men.

Secondly: If Huxley's view is right, all that sin can do is to prevent awareness of a unity which is present, constant, and unbroken beneath. This means that sin is really no more than a mistake, a failure to see a unity which persists unimpaired between the soul and God, whatever wrongs are committed. This error is typical of a certain type of idealism which has an ancestry as old as Plato. But sin is really more than this. It is the actual rupture of fellowship with God, which cannot be restored without an act of forgiveness.

Thirdly: This cosmology, if believed in by a logically consistent man, will lead to a selfish and individualistic ethic. The ethic consistent with pantheistic mysticism is an ethic of salvation by disentanglement. It does not really, as Huxley maintains, entail the practice of all the virtues, but degrades every virtue into a means for attaining to the enjoyment of the mystical experience. Do not the virtues, when thus degraded, become on a par with the devices used by the Yogins for attaining their mystical experiences?

Jesus, says Huxley, taught the ethic of non-attachment. This is a dangerous quarter-truth. Jesus taught that love to God and man must come first, and that all other loves and desires must take second place. He never taught that perfect non-attachment casteth out fear. Huxley's main emphasis is on non-attachment, although he says that along with this there must be attachment to a reality conceived as greater and worthier than the self. Jesus would turn such a statement on its head. His first command is not negative but positive—'Seek ye the kingdom of God and his righteousness.' And anything which might in any way resemble non-attachment comes with Him a long way second. To picture the Cross as an example of non-attachment would, for example, be to show oneself without any appreciation for ethical realities whatsoever. In a true ethic of non-attachment there is no place at all for Jesus' ardent love for men.

But, of course, Huxley's ethic is not an ethic of non-attachment. It is nothing so poor or negative. *Eyeless in Gasa* comes to an end with the determina-

tion of Antony Beavis to go forward, in spite of threats to his life, with his plans for addressing a meeting on the ideal of non-violence. The ethic expressed in such a decision is fundamentally inconsistent with a cosmology of pantheistic mysticism.

India is the classical case of a country which, through the ages, has put into practice the ethic of non-attachment. What have been the large-scale ethical consequences of the pantheistic mysticism of India during the last three thousand years? The result has been the drafting out of her more eager and spiritual minds into seclusion from active life in hermit sanctuaries, and the removal of these men from contact with the peoples whom they might have done so much to raise ethically and religiously. The results have been disastrous to the nation. Here is true non-attachment: By their fruits ye shall know them!

But, it will be quite fairly objected, what an indictment of Christianity might be compiled by some writer who would give a broad outline of the history of Europe during the last two thousand years! Surely it is not fair to judge of any system except by the life and teaching of its best exponents. Do not the great pantheistic mystics preach love and benevolence?

In answer to this objection it may be illuminating to quote a passage from Rudolf Otto's *Mysticism, East and West*, which contrasts the ethical teaching of Sankhara, one of the noblest pantheists, with that of Eckhart, the Christian mystic. Otto says, 'It is because the background of Sankhara's teaching is not Palestine but India, that his mysticism has no ethic. It is not immoral. It is amoral. The Mukta, the redeemed, who has attained unity with the eternal Brahman, is removed from all works, whether good or evil. Works bind man. The redeemed leaves all activity, and reposes on eternal oneness.'

With Eckhart it is entirely different, Otto goes on to say. For him the Divine Being is conceived as essential righteousness, for it has within it the God of the prophets and the Gospels. And thus to attain to unity with God the soul must act as God acts. Eckhart is too much influenced by Christianity to advocate the cessation of all doing and willing. The conclusion to be drawn is, that where the Pantheistic mystics advocate a noble morality their ethic is inconsistent with their cosmology.

Fourthly: Can such a world as Huxley depicts be said in the last resort to have any meaning at all? It is one of his claims that his system has restored meaning to the universe as a whole—a more satis-

factory meaning than is ascribed to it by the Christian cosmology. I should like to ask him what he means by 'meaning?'—Has he reflected sufficiently on this matter? Can there be meaning in the universe without there being purpose? Are not value and purpose correlatives? And can a universe whose final reality is impersonal be said to have any meaning or purpose or value whatsoever? Not only ethical values are destroyed if God be described as impersonal and amoral. The disappearance of ethical values might not in itself be fatal to Huxley's cosmology, if æsthetic values were left. For these values might be realized in the world, thus giving it a meaning. But if the final reality be impersonal, the whole can no longer be said to have any value at all. For value presupposes a personal subject for whom it is valid. In so far as there are persons within reality there may be meanings within reality, but if there be no ultimate and absolute Person there can be no constitutive value or meaning in reality itself as a whole. Huxley could not say that God looked upon the Universe and saw that it was good, for to do this

would be to presuppose that God was personal. With his denial of personality to God the whole attempt to give meaning to the universe as a whole collapses finally.

The Christian cosmology, on the other hand, maintains that God is good, and that He is least inadequately represented as Personality. Therefore there is, we maintain, a Divine purpose behind the world, though it cannot yet be clearly seen, our vision of it being as yet blinded by sin. The goal of human life is to work with God. Not union, in the sense of absorption in God, but communion with Him, is the end for which man was created. Love is of the essence of God's nature, therefore men should love, being created in God's image so that love appeals to their highest nature. Here and here alone is an adequate cosmological basis for Huxley's ethic. He has, it is true, for the time being rejected the Christian cosmology, but his reasons for doing so are singularly inadequate, and not any more likely to satisfy him permanently than his grounds for accepting a pantheistic mysticism as the basis for his ethic.

Literature.

THE INDWELLING GOD.

The Indwelling God: A Historical Study of the Christian Conception of Divine Immanence and Incarnation, with special Reference to Indian Thought, by Principal E. C. Dewick, M.A. (Milford; 10s. 6d. net), is an important book, its value consisting not so much in its positive conclusions as in the review it gives of the place that divine immanence has held through the centuries within the Christian Church, as well as to some extent in the chief non-Christian religions. Principal Dewick admits at the conclusion of his study that there are many problems associated with his subject which remain unresolved, but he has undoubtedly rendered a considerable service by his careful and balanced survey of the place that this particular conception has held and should hold in Christian teaching, a service all the more valuable in view of the neglect into which it has fallen because of prevailing tendencies in theology at the present time. One reason, probably, why he himself is not inclined to share

in this neglect is that he has lived and worked in India, a land, as he says, where these issues 'are not merely academic but vital, and are presented to the Christian Church as a challenge by the great indigenous tradition of Hinduism.'

It is, indeed, rather striking to note that the important book recently published by Dr. H. Kraemer on 'The Christian Message in a non-Christian world,' a book which is strongly influenced by the anti-immanentist tendencies of to-day, is the work of a man whose mind has been steeped in the study of the religion of Islam. It need not surprise us if in each case the experience gained has helped to create a more sympathetic understanding in the one case of the conception of an immanent and in the other of a transcendent God. In the contrast that one finds between these two books there are, no doubt, other elements as well contributing to the outlook of the authors. There is, for example, the fact that Principal Dewick is an Englishman and an Anglican while Dr. Kraemer is a Dutchman and a Calvinist. Principal Dewick

is quite aware that the influence upon him of the Anglican tradition has almost inevitably guided in considerable measure the direction of his thinking. The two streams of Hellenism and Hebraism which Matthew Arnold detected as present in another sphere in his day are to be found to-day in theology, as Canon Quick has recently pointed out, and each has its own value and importance.

Principal Dewick finds the post-War reaction against immanentism moulding both Anglo-Catholic dogma and Barthianism, two movements that one would not suspect of close kinship. In the case of the former he shows that such immanentists of *Lux Mundi* and *Foundations* as Gore and Temple have in later years undergone a remarkable transformation. It is, however, in the latter movement that hostility to immanence is to be found in its most extreme form. Principal Dewick endeavours to present it fairly and to do justice to the positive gains to religion that Barthianism unquestionably brings with it. 'The perplexity,' he says, 'and even antagonism which Barth's methods of argument arouse almost instinctively in the mind of the average English reader are partly due to the contact between two types of mentality, neither of which is familiar with the methods of the other; and partly to the difficulty of understanding the finer shades of meaning in technical theological terms when translated from one language into another.'

It is interesting to note that the extreme Barthian doctrine of transcendence, divorcing God wholly from the world, results in our work on earth becoming only 'play,' just as the Vedantist finds as a consequence of his doctrine. And, again, to the Barthian, apparently, Christian service is to be done, just as the *Bhagavadgita* enjoins, in a spirit of indifference. What that Hindu Scripture calls 'work done without desire' is not unlike service rendered in obedience to God, indeed, but with a full recognition of its futility. Here, as was to be expected, 'monergism' and acosmic monism come to quite similar conclusions.

Principal Dewick does not seem to have noted that Dr. Brunner is not now to be counted among the 'monergists.' He holds what he calls 'the fundamentally opposed doctrine of personal correspondence.' Not every one can hold together, as Karl Barth himself can, such a counsel of extremes, as we find in his teaching, and modifications may be expected.

Faith in God, the Indweller, Principal Dewick holds, and surely rightly, 'is in some form a necessity for religion and any attempt to suppress it is bound to fail, for it stands securely rooted in

the laws of the spiritual world.' Barth stands at one extreme in the interpretation of the Christian doctrine of God and the world, while Eckhart travelled far in his time to a directly opposite extreme. Eckhart suddenly awoke to his error when he realized that if he was right in his speculations then God could not be love. Surely one must come to the same conclusion if God is solely transcendent. When we survey the alternatives we are compelled to agree with Principal Dewick in 'the wisdom of the Middle Path.'

THE MINISTER: HIS WORLD AND HIS WORK.

We find Professor William Adams Brown (whose works on theology are so widely known) in *The Minister: His World and His Work* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net) on a line of research which is to most readers somewhat unexpected. He is concerned with the relation of the minister, not to projects of intellectual worth to the Faith but of value to the community. This is a study of pressing tasks and problems in actual practical work. In the preparatory chapters he seeks to establish the true basis for his theme by surveying the world in which the minister finds himself. We speak of the Church as Apostolic. But if we could bring back St. Paul to life, and take him for a tour of our American churches, he would not know how to reconcile their imposing edifices, and still more their elaborate bank accounts with the primitive simplicity of the Corinthian Church. How different is our environment from that of the Corinthian Church. How different is our environment to-day. Science has not only accelerated speed, it has annihilated space. It has brought East and West together and, with the rapprochement, it has brought to birth a host of problems unforeseen. The authority of the Christian revelation is challenged. In Russia that authority is uncompromisingly rejected. We are told that religion is the opiate of the people, beguiling them by the promise of happiness after death to prevent acceptance of present-day evils. The issue is between Christ and Cæsar as it was in the days before the conversion of Constantine. In the midst of this unspeakable period is set the Church. She has been defined as a society which hazards her reputation by association with the unworthy, and so perpetuates the incarnation of her Lord. It is true that we cannot demonstrate the existence of God. Yet multitudes of highly intelligent people have been convinced that of all possible explanations of the world that of theism

is the most reasonable. Even science is willing to admit that in the present trend of thought it is as easy to begin with mind as with matter. Yet to establish a basis of belief is not sufficient. Many people who believe in God quite sincerely have no vivid consciousness of His presence. God is not something that we create, but something that we discover. A Dutch philosopher said that religion begins when a man applies the personal pronoun to God. Often it is just our sense of being forsaken that opens our eyes to the place where God is really at work. There is an inadequacy that leads us beyond ourselves for help. There is a misconception in our thinking, if we imagine we can read God only when we leave Nature and men behind. Nature is the instrument which He is using for His self-revelation. When we meet Jesus we discover for the first time that which answers to what is deepest in ourselves. He becomes in the truest sense God's *Word* for us. No longer is He simply a man among men, but God manifest in the flesh for our salvation. The Bible is God's Book to us, not because it tells us what happened in the world long ago, but because it tells us what is happening in the world to-day, and what may happen to us. There is no challenge to faith in what we see which has not been met by faith in the past, and vanquished.

The needs of our time and its many enigmas bring into prominence the need to restore the teaching-office of the ministry. Great numbers of our children are growing up practically pagan. They have not even a bowing acquaintance with that greatest of treasures, the English Bible. The rank and file of our ministers, Professor Adams Brown contends, fail to take the teaching-office seriously. We have to understand the religion that we profess. We have to impart our knowledge to those who possess it not. Christianity is challenge as well as promise. It summons to conflict, as well as providing an assurance of peace.

This suggests to the practical person the need of some revision of our curriculum in training. The author tells how again and again across the Atlantic he has to meet complaints that the graduates of the seminaries are not fully equipped to solve the daily problems of their parishes. What we have to bring men is not simply an ideal, important and indeed essential as that is. Evidence is required that there is a power at work in the world which is translating that ideal into reality. This is part of the motive of Professor Adams Brown's thesis. His contention is that the successful evangelists have made *witness* their stock in trade. It is our

own paganism, our own imperfect application of the principles of the gospel that has been the responsible factor in rival cults. We must carry into every situation the tonic of an unconquerable faith.

RELIGION IN GERMANY.

It is very difficult (almost impossible) to follow intelligently the course of the Church controversy in Germany from the occasional fragmentary news about it in the daily press. The Rev. A. S. Duncan-Jones, the Dean of Chichester, has rendered a valuable service in offering us a well-informed, discerning, and sympathetic record of it—*The Struggle for Religious Freedom in Germany* (Gollancz; 8s. 6d. net). His account of the principles of National Socialism should make clear the inherent antagonism of the Totalitarian State, even if professing to be based on positive Christianity, and offering an assurance of the freedom of the Church. The demand that the Evangelical Protestant churches should adopt a constitution in conformity with the principles of the State was accepted by the churches, although inconsistent with this assurance of freedom. Within the Church, a party, 'The German Christians,' soon made clear what this positive Christianity meant, and, snatching power by illegitimate means, sought further to conform the action of the churches to the policy of the State in the arbitrary dictatorship of the Reichsbishop Müller. This challenge was accepted by the Confessional Synod, who exposed the paganism of the positive Christianity, and opposed the Reichsbishop's misrule. Even the State had to recognize the failure of his dictatorship; and, suspending him from the exercise of his office, replaced him by a civil servant, Herr Kerl. His appointment of a Committee of pastors under the chairmanship of the highly honoured and widely trusted Dr. Zöllner to bring about order with a view to the restoration of self-government in the Church looked like the first step in a movement towards reconciliation. Thwarted by agents of the Government on every hand, this Committee was forced to resign; and not long after Dr. Zöllner died. Herr Kerl then showed his true colours, and assumed the rôle of a dictator, seeking by financial pressure, issue of numerous decrees, imprisonment of pastors who disobeyed, to break down all opposition. The victim of this policy, who attracted the eyes of the world, was Dr. Niemöller; his virtual acquittal was a credit to the Court which tried him; but his re-arrest and imprisonment in solitary confinement in a con-

centration camp by the Secret Policy shows the ruthlessness of the State in enforcing its Totalitarian claims. There does not seem to be any relaxation of that policy. The danger most apprehended by the Confessional Church is the corruption of youth in the capture of the schools for the world-view (*Weltanschauung*) of National Socialism, and the use of education as antichristian propaganda. Despite the Concordat with the Papacy, Roman Catholicism in Germany is being exposed to as severe repression. The ecclesiastical situation in Austria, since its forcible annexation, is precarious and confused. That 'the positive Christianity' of National Socialism is another religion than the Christian is a summons to 'Christian solidarity,' not only within Germany itself but throughout the world. The Christian churches of Great Britain can strengthen and encourage the persecuted witnesses of the gospel, not in Germany only, for the persecution is widespread, by their witness to the gospel, and their claim for the churches to be free to preach it. Such is a summary of the contents of this competent, interesting, and important book, which deserves careful and prayerful study, as the struggle for religious freedom in Germany is but one phase of the conflict of to-day between Christ and Antichrist.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE TO AFRICA.

The Church and Primitive Peoples, by Mr. Denys W. T. Shropshire, C.R., B.Litt., D.Phil. (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), is a substantial volume investigating with much fullness and detail 'the religious institutions and beliefs of the Southern Bantu and their bearing on the problems of the Christian missionary.' It is one of a considerable number of books recently published that seek to contribute to a solution of what Messrs. Melland & Cullen Young in a recent volume call 'the African Dilemma.' Dr. R. R. Marett, who contributes a Foreword, asks how we are to frame a just estimate of the value of our civilization for the natives of Africa. Much of the dilemma that is presented to us is concerned with the answer to that question. Dr. Shropshire provides material that should be most useful in forming a just estimate of the value of the African civilization as well. With this subject, however, this review will not attempt to deal. Two interesting sentences of Dr. Marett may be quoted. 'Here,' he writes, 'is the opportunity of the missionary—somehow to combat the tendency (on the part of the African) to lose heart. His duty is to supply the psychological bridge-work.'

Dr. Marett is dealing with the 'civilizations' that meet and conflict in Africa. But in addition to that conflict there is a religious conflict, and it is to what Dr. Shropshire says in regard to it that we wish to give some consideration. It is true that in the case of Africa a division can hardly be made between the social and the religious. At the same time, the presentation of the Christian message to Africa can be considered by itself apart from the many difficult questions that arise with reference to tribal laws and marriage customs. Thus, after an account of the religion of the Southern Bantu—largely ancestor worship—Dr. Shropshire sums up the values he finds in it and then draws some interesting conclusions. 'If Christianity,' he writes, 'cannot find a place for this worship then it has not yet found itself and is not the religion it claims to be. . . . The tendency to this type of worship is a primal impulse probably rooted in the essential divinity of man and the second great commandment. "We are God by participation," says S. John of the Cross, and to this truth ancestor-worship is rooted. If this is so, it is futile to suppress it, and transformation and transmutation are the only possible solution. It is part of the very soul of the human race and represents the truth enshrined in the twofold nature of the God-man, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' (p. 371).

Dr. Shropshire goes on to relate this African worship to 'the doctrine and practice of the Communion of Saints.' 'No doubt,' he concludes, 'such a measure of approach to primitive and indigenous religion is fraught with great dangers.' They are dangers that are apparent to this day in the still surviving Mediterranean paganism and should at least make one hesitate before accepting a course that might have similar consequences for the Church in Africa. Again he emphasizes (p. 437) that Christianity must be presented to the Africans as 'the fullest expression of that for which their fathers groped,' 'not as something foreign to them but a linking on to the best of their aspirations.'

It is worth while to place alongside of these statements the view of Dr. H. Kraemer in his recent book on 'The Christian Message in a non-Christian World.' To him, in spite of his real sympathy with primitive peoples and his recognition of the necessity of understanding their 'folk-ways' and religious customs and of entering into their thoughts and dreams, it is clear that Christianity must be placed before them, not as 'a linking on to the best of their aspirations,' but as a divine word that confronts and judges them. 'Paganism and the

prophetic religion of Biblical realism are not continuous with each other.' It is evident that there is a sharp divergence between the two views here presented. Perhaps one reason for this difference is that Dr. Shropshire belongs to the Anglican tradition, to which the Incarnation may be said to be central, while Dr. Kraemer inherits the Reformed doctrine, to which justification by faith is central. First in 'the immediate Gospel for the Bantu come the sacraments,' according to the former. To the latter 'the message of the Gospel is that God not only can forgive but that He does forgive in Jesus Christ.'

One could point to other significant indications of this divergence of view in regard to a matter of central importance for the Christian cause. Will this emerge at the Conference that is to meet at Tambaram, Madras, at the close of this year? It is desirable that it should and that this whole matter should be fully and carefully examined by the Church in all its borders.

MR. MIDDLETON MURRY.

Heaven—and Earth, by Mr. John Middleton Murry (Cape; 10s. 6d. net), is a powerful, artistic, and acutely critical book. It is better at the beginning than at the end, but probably the conciseness of the conclusion emphasizes the directness of the appeal. The author's main contention is the familiar but very relevant one that civilization is on the edge of disaster because man's power of invention has got beyond his control, humanity being comparable to a defective child, now approaching adolescence, whose muscles and limbs have grown enormously, but whose mental capacities have not kept pace with this development. The disease of modern society is diagnosed by the historical method, but selectively, the design being to show the emergence of present-day conditions as viewed through the experiences of a succession of men of genius 'who experienced in act or imagination the travail of its becoming.'

So the main conception of leaders of thought from Chaucer to William Morris are brought under review, but, true to his central purpose, Mr. Murry goes further back still—to St. Paul and to Jesus Christ. He holds that Western civilization is distinctively a Christian civilization, and that its possible ruin is due to the fact that it has not been Christian enough, having failed to realize that the only remedy lies in the recovery of a sense of the worth of the individual as bound to the community through the law of love, implicitly and essentially

made effective for humanity in the Cross of Christ. 'Either this civilization of ours,' the author says, 'will preserve its continuity as a Christian civilization, or it will give way—after a period of chaos and barbarism such as is truly beyond our capacity to imagine—to a civilization which is not Christian at all.' There is no middle position.

No doubt this is a machine age, but one argument of the book is that even the machine was the outcome of the invigoration of the individual, and that this again was due to St. Paul's experience of 'Christ in him,' the Christ who was recognized by the Apostle as no Jewish leader, but the universal Saviour of humanity. The religious vigour of the individual, with its practical effectiveness, was recovered at the Reformation, but the Reformation gave us only half the truth, and the Counter-Reformation had also its valuable contribution to make. Mr. Murry is no Romanist, but his plea is that 'the Protestants shall repent of their destruction of the Catholic "idea,"' and re-establish religious control in purer form. The Church has failed in the past because those to whom power was entrusted could not bear their superhuman responsibility, and betrayed the cause of the common man, but the Church need not fail in the future, and 'the main hope of saving Christian civilization from total disaster is the rebuilding of the universal Christian Church.'

The book begins its historical survey with Chaucer, and, taking the help of Montaigne, Pascal, and the Paston letters, describes the emergence from mediævalism which preceded the age of Cromwell and Milton. An interesting comparison of these two is given, by no means favourable to Milton. Cromwell, according to the author, is both more Christian and more modern. A subtle and illuminating defence of Rousseau's conception of Nature assigns to him greater importance than is usually allowed. While the sublimity of Goethe's sense of vocation is admitted, and his appreciation of the power of Christianity is recognized, he is held to have missed the essential spirit of that religion through his insensitiveness to the place of suffering in its redemptive influence. We have rarely come across so acute an analysis both of the earlier development of Wordsworth and of his relapse into sheer conservatism in later life. Godwin and Shelley have high places in Mr. Murry's esteem, and he is at considerable pains to remove certain misconceptions regarding them. The chapters on Karl Marx and William Morris are not so satisfying, but the contrast between them serves to bring out a characteristic view of the whole book—that

revolution tending towards socialism is futile unless it begins in the heart and mind of man, unless, in other words, socialism becomes essentially a religion.

All those whom he has commemorated are, in the author's conception, the creators of the modern world, not of its body (which may be left to the technicians and the inventors and some of the scientists) but of its soul. The body of our present-day society, left to itself, is tearing itself to pieces, and there is all the more need for those who have striven to regenerate the world by the divine vision which has revealed to them the essential gospel of the love of God in Christ.

THE DIDACHE AND MONTANISM.

There has been published for the Historical Society a learned volume entitled *The Riddle of the Didache* (S.P.C.K. ; 12s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. F. E. Vokes, Chaplain at Cranbrook School. Since 1883, when Philotheus Bryennius published at Constantinople the real 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,' the *Didache*, as being the one major discovery in early Church History, has become, to use Dr. Bigg's phrase, the 'spoiled child of criticism.' The problem of the *Didache* is, as Mr. Vokes says, whether it is 'a picture of the Church at the time when it was written, an antiquarian picture of the Church as it was some time in the past, or an imaginary picture.' In his opinion Armitage Robinson was right in holding that the writer of the *Didache* tries to give a picture of a Church in New Testament or 'apostolic' language, that he may bring out what is common to his Church and that of the New Testament. This theory is said to explain both the mixture of primitiveness and development that is found in the *Didache* and the few peculiarities we also find there. It makes the *Didache* an unusual sort of book, but perhaps on that very account the perplexed student will turn to it in hope.

Here is a brief account of some of Mr. Vokes's conclusions, based as these are on a very thorough and scholarly analysis of this ancient document. In compiling his book the writer of the *Didache* employs among other sources Barnabas, *Hermas*, and the New Testament. The probable date of the book is about the end of the second century A.D. In doctrine he is a moderate Montanist, and he attempts to express Montanism in 'apostolic' terms, not to prove that Montanism is primitive Christianity. The *Didache*, in short, can only be set comfortably in the context of early Montanism.

PRAYER.

Hear My Prayer (Hodder & Stoughton ; 5s. net), is a book to help men to pray. All ambiguity as to the title may be removed if it is explained that here are no collected 'supplications,' nor forms of prayer, but essays on various aspects of the spiritual art. S. T. Coleridge called prayer the highest energy of which the human mind is capable. Part I. is *The Answers that Come*. Part II. is *The Difficulties that Hinder*. There are instances to begin with of prayer in a slum tenement by Hugh Redwood, and of Sister Eva's experience, etc. There are illustrations culled from life of God's guidance, and some of the problems involved are dealt with by the Dean of St. Paul's. He remarks that there are people who seem to think that they can find the guidance of God by emptying their minds of all thought. There is no ground in the New Testament for this notion. Nevertheless, there are times when 'guidance' seems to be given without the normal process of making up our minds. The faith in God which we learn from Christ is not a pretending that the causes of anxiety do not exist, but a conviction that the power is available to deal with them, and to make good out of them. Each chapter of the book is written by some specialist. The phases of the devout life are as many-sided as the writers' viewpoints. Some of them enlarge on the gift of moral power which prayer bequeathes, some on the reasons for a negative answer. Intellectual difficulties are met. The questions put are salient, and have relation to modern doubt. Moral enigmas are studied. The sense of disharmony is carefully analysed, and the deterring influence that it exerts to our advance to the throne of grace. Dr. Frank Buchman is reported to have said that after his conversion he wrote six letters to men whom he felt that he had wronged. He did not get six replies ; but he did receive a tremendous sense of personal release. Other sections give light on times and seasons, method, discipline, etc. There is a delightfully written Epilogue on *Prayer and Life* by Evelyn Underhill. The book runs on to over five hundred pages, closely packed. The quotations are apposite ; the reasoning is in many instances cogent ; the teaching is largely Scriptural. Ministers and teachers of religion will find in the volume fresh matter for discussions on this great theme. The unknown editor has to be congratulated on the symposium to which we are invited. 'Sir, there is no argument for prayer,' said Samuel Johnson. Yet here are pleas to which he would not have been ready to turn an unheeding ear. For, Carlyle

penned a sentence in a letter to a friend that all devout souls endorse: 'Prayer is and remains the native and deepest impulse of the soul of man.'

THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

The Divinity of Jesus Christ, by Professor John Martin Creed, D.D. (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net), contains the Hulsean Lectures for 1936. As indicated in the sub-title, it is in the main 'A Study in the History of Christian Doctrine since Kant.' It traces in an exceedingly instructive way the development of Christian thought from Schleiermacher and Hegel, through Strauss to Ritschl and the Barthian school. Only in the last lecture do we come to a constructive statement on the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Here the discussion is marked by caution and restraint. Quoting the dictum of Dr. Hort that 'no possible modification can be accepted as Christianity which contradicts the broad testimony of Scripture, and requires the re-writing of its most distinctive passages,' the writer affirms that the task of the Christian theologian must be to 'seek to understand, appropriate, and convey afresh the essential motives which lie behind those Apostolic teachings.' Three leading New Testament thoughts must find a place in the Church's doctrine of its Lord. These are beliefs in God as creative mind and will behind, as well as within, the world of sense experience, the significance of Jesus Christ as a revelation in time of the Eternal God, and the Apostolic conviction that He who was Jesus Christ was also the Divine agent in the creation of the world. 'The doctrine of a cosmic Christ is thus a development from the earliest form of faith, but, if the first step in faith was a right one, it was a right development.'

The Rev. W. Bryn Thomas has a mind of his own and a vigorous way of expressing it. In *Religion: Institutional and Personal* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net) he has given nine sermons preached on special occasions in the Church of England. They embody the conviction that 'much of what fails to conform with the *acknowledged forms* of Christianity—whether in organisation or in doctrine—can lay claim to being religious in the highest and the best sense.' In dealing with international disputes the writer maintains that 'the task of deciding any dispute must be taken out of the hands of the disputants and placed in the hands of a third party.' What is to happen if one of the disputants refuses

to arbitrate, and how is the power to be taken out of his hands?—on these points no light is given. The writer's views may not always be acceptable, but his book is very lucid and fitted to stimulate thought.

The Rev. Elbert Russell, who is Dean of the School of Religion in Duke University, has issued a second volume entitled, *More Chapel Talks* (Cokesbury Press, Nashville; \$1.50). It contains over fifty very short addresses on religious and Christian themes. They are written in a clear and pleasant style, and are illustrated by apt quotations and anecdotes. The writer is evidently a Pacifist, as he is quite entitled to be, but his picture of the grossness of the soldier's life is greatly overdrawn. The Allied troops in France were not such sensual brutes as he implies.

United Christian Front, edited by Sir Henry S. Lunn (Heffer; 3s. 6d. net), contains the record of 'A Discussion on the Hellenic Travellers' Club Cruise, February–March 1938.' Discussion is hardly the right word, for the papers read were prepared quite independently of each other, and no account is given of how they were received or criticised. The situation was an interesting one. Sir Henry Lunn gathered a distinguished company and succeeded in getting papers from four members of the Church of Rome. Among others who took part may be mentioned the Bishop of Southwark, Dean Inge, Principal Cairns, Lord Polwarth, and Dr. Rattenbury. The general idea which prompted the Conference was the urgent need for the forces of the Christian Church to stand shoulder to shoulder in face of the rampant materialism of the age and the claims of the Totalitarian State. The papers read, as one would expect from the distinction of their authors, contain much that is wise, timely, and deeply Christian. At the close of the discussions a short statement was drawn up indicating points which the speakers regarded as of fundamental importance, such as Christian co-operation without waiting for organic Church union; definite resistance to Totalitarian claims; the application of Christian principles to political and international affairs; and the obligation to help persecuted fellow-Christians.

Principal Nathaniel Micklem has done well to recall us by means of the little volume he has edited, called *A Book of Personal Religion* (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net), to the teaching of some of the spiritual classics on which, next to the

Bible, our fathers nourished their spiritual life. Since Alexander Whyte passed from among us there has been no great voice in Scotland bidding us sell our bed and buy Baxter's 'Saint's Everlasting Rest' or Doddridge's 'Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul.' Dr. Moffatt, indeed, many years ago, published a volume of selections from John Owen which has probably long ago been 'remaindered.' This little book that the Principal of Mansfield College has edited should re-awaken churchmen in England and Scotland of Calvinist descent to the wealth of their spiritual inheritance and bring them back perhaps to some of the means made use of by the saints of our land in former days to deepen their faith and discipline their lives. 'This will make,' says Matthew Henry, speaking of family religion, 'your family comforts double comforts and your family crosses but half crosses; it will turn a tent into a temple, a cottage into a palace.'

A new edition of the New Testament which will be eagerly bought and highly appreciated has been sent out by the Lutterworth Press—*The Book of Books*, a Translation in Modern Paragraph Form (2s. 6d. net). The translation is issued under the supervision of Mr. R. Mercer Wilson, General Secretary of the United Society for Christian Literature. He has had the help of many eminent scholars and others not so eminent, whose names occupy a page and a half. Features of this edition are that poetry and quotations and phrases that echo something in the Old Testament are printed in italics, square brackets are used for alternative renderings and editorial comment, a brief introduction has been supplied to each book, and words or phrases found in some manuscripts but not in others are indicated by circular brackets. The cadence and rhythm of the Authorized Version have been preserved, but Versions like Tyndale's as well as Aramaic sources have been utilized.

It must not be supposed, however, that this is a version for scholars. It has in view mainly young people and those who might be attracted by the New Testament if it were presented in a pleasing form. The print is clear, well-spaced, and beautiful. Some time ago the 'Times Literary Supplement' asked why popular editions of the Bible should not be issued with paragraphs arranged according to logic and sense, so that it might percolate to the masses and the schools. This book is meant to furnish the answer. We have had many similar efforts to provide Bibles that appear like other books, most of them abridged. This one is un-

abridged, and we question whether any previous edition can compare with this one either in attractiveness or in price. It is amazing that such a book, large, well furnished, in legible type, can be issued at half a crown. It ought to have a wide circulation. There are, it should be added, two excellent maps of Palestine and the Roman world.

Christian Life in Practice, edited by Mr. Frederick A. Tatford (Pickering & Inglis; 1s. 6d. net), contains twelve short papers by different writers, reprinted from 'The Harvester.' They are so brief that they cannot go deeply into any subject. They are, probably with intention, made exceedingly simple and elementary so that the unlearned and the ignorant may not be without guidance. Among the topics treated are Sex Morality, Politics, Clericalism, Trade Unionism, Recreations, and Foreign Missions.

The Religious Book Club has added to its list, and issued with an attractive binding, the Rev. Conrad Noel's *Life of Jesus* at the remarkable price of 2s. 6d. net. This book was reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES on its first publication some time ago, and it may be sufficient now to herald its appearance in its new form. The book was an achievement, and will remain one of the best of recent contributions to the understanding of the Lord's ministry and teaching. It is the fruit of much research and independent thought, and it is delightfully easy to read.

A book of devotional meditations on the Gospels of an unusual kind has been written by Mlle Suzanne de Dietrich and translated by the Rev. Hugh Martin—*Behold Thy King* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). Mlle de Dietrich has been for many years a leader in the work of the Student Christian Movement, and is apparently a woman of real spiritual insight and originality. Her book was published in France under the title *C'Était l'Heure de l'Offrande*, and is the fruit of her independent contact with the Gospels. The meditations are brief, and suggestive rather than expansive. But readers will find many flashes of light on familiar passages. On the baptism of Jesus she remarks that Jesus had three baptisms—one of water, a second of the Spirit, and the third of suffering and blood. On the Baptist's demands from his hearers she says that three worlds are involved—the world of the well-to-do, the world of business, and the world of politics. These are characteristic comments, and there are many like them.

After Fifty Years.

II. The Text of the Greek New Testament.

By SIR F. G. KENYON, LONDON.

FIFTY years ago the state of knowledge and opinion with regard to the text of the New Testament was as it had been left by the Revised Version of 1881, and the edition of the Greek text by Westcott and Hort in the same year. Both were the result of the long accumulation of evidence which began with the arrival of the Codex Alexandrinus in England in 1627 (sixteen years after the publication of the Authorized Version), and culminated in Tischendorf's discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus in 1859, and his publication in 1867 of the first satisfactory edition of the Codex Vaticanus. By that time it had become evident to scholars that the Greek text printed by Stephanus in 1550, from which the Authorized Version had been translated, could no longer be accepted as satisfactory. It rested for the most part on a handful of late manuscripts which embodied the text that, after centuries of corruption and correction at the hands of scribes and editors, had become standardized in the Eastern Church. In the case of no work of classical literature would scholars be satisfied with manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries if manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries were available; and that was the position in which Biblical scholars found themselves in the second half of the nineteenth century.

It was in these conditions that Westcott and Hort addressed themselves to the preparation of a new edition of the Greek New Testament. Utilizing the materials accumulated by many scholars and arranged by Tregelles and Tischendorf, they classified them on lines laid down by Bengel and Griesbach into three main groups: (1) the type of text found in the great mass of later authorities, which they called *Syrian*, because it first makes its appearance in the Syrian Fathers of the end of the fourth century, but for which the better name is *Byzantine*, as denoting that it became the standard text of the Byzantine Church; (2) the type found in the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices and the small group of authorities that support them, which they called *Neutral*, because they thought it had come down without material contamination or editorial re-handling; and (3) the type found especially in Græco-Latin manuscripts such as Codex Bezae and in the Old Latin version, with support from the Old

Syriac version and several of the early Fathers, which they called *Western*, because of its predominantly Latin attestation. As between these three, they ruled out the first as being a late and secondary type of text; and as between the remaining two, both of which were found in early witnesses, they rejected the Western as showing all the signs of editorial mishandling and an unjustifiably free treatment of the text, and pinned their faith on the Neutral type, and particularly and predominantly on the Codex Vaticanus.

Westcott and Hort were members of the Revision Committee, and carried much weight by reason of their scholarship and intimate acquaintance with the subject; and though not all the Revisers would go all the way with them, it was under their predominant influence that the Revised Version was produced. And when the dust of the controversy raised by Dean Burgon's vehement and intemperate attack on it had died down, it was the textual theory of Westcott and Hort that held the field.

Such was the state of affairs in 1888. How does it stand in 1938?

The first obvious answer is that there has been a great, even an amazing, increase of material. In particular, a whole new chapter of textual history has been opened by the discovery of Greek papyrus manuscripts in Egypt. In 1888 there were no known Biblical manuscripts older than the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, which were assigned to the first half of the fourth century; and though the New Testament was in far better case, in respect both of age and quantity of evidence, than any work of classical literature, there was still a gap of some two hundred and fifty or more years between the dates of these earliest manuscripts and those of the original composition of the sacred books. Before the fourth century, the normal material on which books were written was papyrus, which under most conditions of climate is very perishable; and although during the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century some few scores of papyrus manuscripts had come to light from the exceptionally dry soil of Egypt, they included only one fragment of the Bible, and that of late date. It was supposed that practically all Biblical manuscripts before the date at which vellum superseded papyrus as the principal material

for book production had perished. But within the last fifty years a number of discoveries of portions of Bible manuscripts on papyrus have been made, which carry back the story for a hundred or even two hundred years. Most of them are very small fragments, but in the Chester Beatty papyri, the discovery of which was announced in 1931, we have acquired a group of manuscripts, ranging from the second to the fourth century, which contain substantial portions of most of the books of the New Testament, and many of the Old. Of the New Testament we have one volume, of the first half of the third century, very imperfect, but containing sufficient of all four Gospels and the Acts (especially of Luke and Acts) to show the general character of the text; another, still earlier (round about A.D. 200), containing the Pauline Epistles (except the Pastorals) almost complete; and a third, rather later, containing about a third of the Book of Revelation. At once the gap between our earliest manuscripts and the original publication of the books is reduced by a hundred or a hundred and fifty years, and we still find the text substantially that which we have previously known.

Nor is this all. The discovery among the Chester Beatty collection of a manuscript of the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy, in the Greek Septuagint version, which can be confidently assigned to the first half of the second century, justifies hopes that New Testament manuscripts equally early may yet be laid before us; and in point of fact a tiny scrap of the Gospel of St. John was in 1935 discovered in a parcel of papyri in the John Rylands Library at Manchester by Mr. C. H. Roberts, which is, by the general consent of those competent to judge, not later than A.D. 150. In 1888 there were still those who held the doctrine of Baur and his disciples, that the New Testament books were productions of the period A.D. 130-180, and that the Fourth Gospel was the latest among them. Now we have ocular evidence of the existence of a copy of the Gospel in provincial Egypt at a date which makes it practically certain that the traditional date of the composition of the book, towards the end of the first century, cannot be far wrong.

This is confirmed by another notable discovery. A few months earlier in 1935, Messrs. H. I. Bell and T. C. Skeat, of the British Museum, published some fragments of an unknown Gospel; a narrative, that is, of our Lord's life, other than the four canonical Gospels, obviously early in date, since the writing is of the first half of the second century, and sober and straightforward in character, quite unlike the apocryphal Gospels hitherto known. Further, it has close verbal parallels with both the Synoptics and

the Fourth Gosepl. Either, therefore, it is one of the narratives to which St. Luke makes reference in the preface to his Gospel, or (as most scholars seem to hold) it is a composition based upon the canonical Gospels, in which case it is a further proof of the early date at which the Fourth Gospel existed and was in accepted use.

So much for the papyri, which have added during the last fifty years a whole new province to textual criticism, and have taught us how the books of the New Testament circulated in the two centuries immediately following the age of the Apostles. But within the same period there have also been discoveries of vellum manuscripts. In 1906 Mr. Charles L. Freer, of Detroit, a great collector of Oriental paintings, acquired from a Cairo dealer four Biblical manuscripts, two of the Old Testament and two of the New. The most important of these was a copy of the four Gospels in a small hand quite unlike those of the great uncial manuscripts, yet assuredly of about the same period. It seems to come in date between the Sinaiticus and the Alexandrinus, but nearer the latter. Its text is curiously composite, showing that it must have been copied from several manuscripts of different character. In Matthew and most of Luke it ranges itself with the Alexandrinus as an early example of the common Byzantine text. In John and in the first third of Luke it is of the Alexandrian type, akin to the Vaticanus. In the first five chapters of Mark it is Western in character. In the rest of Mark it is of a type different from all of these, of which more will be said presently; and in the middle of the last twelve verses (which are now universally recognized as forming no part of the original Gospel) it inserts an additional passage, part of which was previously known from a quotation by Jerome, who says it was found in some copies, chiefly Greek ones, while the rest of it was previously unknown.

The peculiar type of text found in most of Mark links this discovery with another, and helps to build up the most important addition that has been made of late years to textual theory. So long ago as 1877 Dr. W. H. Ferrar, of Dublin, called attention to four manuscripts of the Gospels, as forming a related group with several very distinctive readings. In 1902 Dr. Kirsopp Lake indicated another group of four, and further showed that in Mark these allied themselves with the Ferrar group and a few others in offering a form of text definitely distinct from those of any of Westcott and Hort's groups. Next, in 1913, the text was published of a late and very roughly written MS. from the region of the Caucasus, known as the Koridethi Codex, which presented a somewhat similar text of Mark. Finally, in 1924,

the late Canon Streeter linked up all these separate observations, and showed that all these manuscripts formed a single family, and that readings of this type are found in the quotations in the writings of Origen during the last period of his life, when he was living at Cæsarea. To this type, therefore, he gave the name of the *Cæsarean* text, which thus takes its place alongside of the Byzantine (or Syrian), Alexandrian (or Neutral), and Western texts. Whether it originated at Cæsarea (where the library of Pamphilus was a home of textual study) or not, is another question. Lake pointed out some indications that Origen used a text of this type before he left Alexandria; and when it appeared that the Chester Beatty papyrus had in Mark a text with strong affinities with the Cæsarean, the probability was increased that the original home of this type is to be found in Egypt.

Yet another discovery, of earlier date, was that of an early Syriac translation of the Gospels. In 1892, two Cambridge ladies, Mrs. Lewis and her twin sister, Mrs. Gibson, visited the monastery of St. Catherine, beneath Mt. Sinai, where Tischendorf in 1859 had discovered the Codex Sinaiticus, and took photographs of a number of manuscripts. One of these was a palimpsest, and when it was examined at Cambridge it was discovered that the underlying text was a Syriac version of the Gospels, quite distinct from the standard Syriac Bible known as the Peshitta, but closely akin to one contained in a manuscript in the British Museum, which had been published by Dr. W. Cureton in 1858. Together, the two manuscripts constitute what is now known as the Old Syriac version, the Sinaitic MS. representing it in its earlier form, which has been somewhat modified in the direction of the Byzantine text in the Curetonian. In not a few readings the Old Syriac allies itself with the Western form found in Codex Bezae and the Old Latin version; and at first some scholars were inclined to argue that the Western family represented the earliest type of text, originally current both in East and West, but gradually ousted successively by the Alexandrian and the Byzantine versions.

This argument brings us to the department of textual theory, as distinct from textual materials. Here, too, there has been much progress during the last fifty years, though theory almost inevitably cannot be as assured as fact. After the publication of the Revised Version in 1881, the first fight, as indicated above, was between the upholders of the 'Received' or Byzantine text, which had held the field ever since the invention of printing, and the advocates of the Revised or Westcott and Hort type of text. By the beginning of our fifty-year period

this contest had been decided, in the opinion of almost all scholars, in favour of Westcott and Hort; but the next move in textual theory was a challenge to Hort's 'Neutral' on the part of the 'Western' text. It was argued that the evidence of the quotations in the early Fathers, which had been decisive against the Byzantine text, was far more often in favour of the 'Western' type than of the 'Neutral.' This contention was strongly reinforced by the appearance of the Sinaitic Syriac, and by intensive study of the Fathers, and of other versions such as the Armenian and the Georgian. Fuller study has, however, greatly weakened the validity of the Western claim. It was quite impossible to form anything like a homogeneous text out of all the materials which were confusedly classed as Western. The variants found in the Old Syriac were by no means always the same as those found in the Old Latin; and the Old Latin authorities rarely agreed among themselves. In short, it gradually became evident that the label 'Western' was being affixed to every reading earlier than the 'Syrian' version which did not appear in the 'Neutral' family. The real description of these, in Westcott and Hort terminology, would be 'non-Neutral pre-Syrian'; and they do not form a single family, but represent all that has survived from a period before the Westcott and Hort families had crystallized into definite form.

All recent discoveries and textual theorizings appear to point to some such conclusion as this. The German scholar, Hermann von Soden, who in 1902-13 produced a monumental edition of the Greek text, after segregating two classes which were practically identical with Hort's 'Syrian' and 'Neutral,' found himself left with a class containing not only the Western authorities properly so called, but a quantity of sub-groups which could by no means be forced into the semblance of a homogeneous family. They included, in fact, all the authorities which Streeter subsequently identified as forming the Cæsarean family; and this can by no possibility be amalgamated with the type of Codex Bezae and the Old Latin. A new conspectus of the textual material seems to be necessary if we are to do justice to the new evidence which the discoveries of recent years have placed at our disposal.

The conception of the early history of the text of the New Testament to which we appear to be tending is somewhat as follows. In the early years there was every opportunity for the growth of much variety of text. There was no authoritative centre from which official copies of the several books were issued, no libraries equipped with trained scribes to produce them. No great importance was attached

to exact accuracy of text. The very idea of a New Testament had not yet come into being. The Gospels were four narratives, among others, of our Lord's life; and it did not much matter whether the exact words of Mark or Luke were there, so long as the substance of the teaching was preserved. The Acts was a story of the early evangelization of the Roman world, to which additions might harmlessly be made by some one who had information of his own on the subject. The Epistles were just so many letters written by Paul or Peter or James or John to this or that Church, each circulating separately in its own surroundings. Further, the Christian Church was scattered in a number of separate communities, at best tolerated by the Roman authorities, but often persecuted; and in times of persecution its books were sought out and destroyed.

We must therefore look on the two centuries following the age of the Apostles as a time in which the books that ultimately formed the New Testament circulated under little control. From time to time, no doubt, some bishop or scholar, noticing the divergences between different copies, might do his best to reconcile them and to remove errors; but his influence would be confined to his own neighbourhood. We know the names of some scholars who worked thus on the text of the Greek Old Testament—Origen, Eusebius, Hesychius, Lucian; and it is possible that they worked also on the New. In this way local types of text would be formed, and it is these which we seem to see in the several textual families now known to us—the Alexandrian (Hort's Neutral) in Egypt; the Cæsarean, perhaps also in Egypt and certainly in Palestine; the Western, in the Latin Churches; the Syriac, in the kingdom of Edessa; and ultimately, the Byzantine, which took possession of the churches of Antioch and Constantinople and drove out the others. And, in addition, it is natural to find in our earliest authorities a number of readings which did not find a home in any of these families.

What, then, is the net result of all these discoveries and of their study by scholars? First, the confirmation of the general integrity of the New Testament text, through the discovery of manuscripts considerably earlier than those previously known. Secondly, the realization that no one type of textual authority commands our exclusive allegiance. All except the Byzantine have early credentials, and it is not likely that the truth is always with any one of them. But this is not to say that all have equal claims on our confidence. If each is ultimately the result of some kind of editorial revision, it is obvious that much depends on the way in which the editor carried out his task. One

editor might be scholarly and conscientious, having access to good MSS., and striving to restore from them the exact words of the original author. Another might be indifferent to accuracy, altering the form of narrative, incorporating passages otherwise known to him, and freely paraphrasing the actual wording. A third might revise the text in what he regarded as the interests of the reader, removing difficulties of phrase, assimilating the narrative in one Gospel to that in another, substituting familiar phrases for those less usual, and so producing an easy but somewhat colourless text. It is because the Alexandrian text appears to be the result of the first of these methods that it still, on the whole, retains the confidence of scholars; but if therefore we may feel entitled to give our general adherence to the Greek text which underlies the Revised Version, we shall do well to recognize that complete certainty in details is not obtainable, and that there may be something yet to be learned from discoveries still to be made.

The present survey has been confined strictly to the text of the New Testament. There has not been space to refer to other discoveries of much interest to Bible students, such as that of a portion of the original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, which throws a rather dubious light on the methods of the translators of the Septuagint; or a small fragment of Deuteronomy in Greek dating back to the second century B.C.—the earliest Biblical manuscript known, now in the John Rylands Library at Manchester; a scrap of the Diatessaron, or concordance of the four Gospels, compiled by Tatian about A.D. 170, and at one time circulating widely in Syria, discovered in the ruins of a Roman fortress on the Euphrates, destroyed in A.D. 256; one portion of the original Greek of the book of Enoch (previously known only in an Ethiopic version), found in a vellum manuscript in Egypt, which also contained portions of the apocryphal Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter; and another portion recently found among the Chester Beatty papyri; or the lost Apology of Aristides, a description and defence of Christianity addressed to the emperor Antoninus Pius about the middle of the second century. All these illustrate the history of the Greek Bible and the origins of Christianity, but do not (except the Diatessaron) directly affect its text. Still less have we tried to indicate the theories of date, origin, composition, and interpretation which, from the days of Baur to those of Dibelius, have arisen, and have engaged the attention of students for a time, and then passed into oblivion. Of these there can be no end; but the text of our New Testament remains, and that text is more securely founded than ever,

Problems of To-day.

II. The Preaching of Sin in the Modern World.

BY PROFESSOR T. H. ROBINSON, D.D., CARDIFF.

FIFTY years ago the preaching of the gospel was predominantly eschatological. Men were warned that the wages of sin was death, and death was interpreted as meaning endless punishment. All humanity was involved, either through hereditary guilt or through universal failure to observe the demands of a righteous God; there was not one righteous, no not one. From this eternal disaster there was but one means of escape: 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.'

It was almost inevitable that there should be, sooner or later, a reaction against this position. In addition to countless other weaknesses it carried with it a suggestion of vindictiveness on the part of God, and it was difficult to reconcile the whole theory with a genuine belief in divine love. The Catholic Church was, to a great extent, relieved of the problem by its doctrine of Purgatory, but evangelical Protestantism could offer only the stark alternative—heaven or hell. Jesus, too, was discovered in the pages of the Gospels, and people turned from the Augustinian and Calvinistic interpretations of St. Paul to the historic character and teaching of Our Lord. Belief in the Fatherhood of God triumphed, and, with its victory, hell vanished from the creeds.

This was not wholly an evil. The Church militant is more effective (though it may be smaller) when recruited from volunteers than when composed of refugees. The picture of God becomes more consistent, and He is freed from the imputation of having been defeated and compelled to abandon His children. Jesus comes into harmony with the Father instead of being contrasted with Him. Those of us whose infant creed was based on the hymn 'Jesus, who lived above the sky,' have ceased to imagine that the Christ interposed to save us from the wrath of God, and are able to grasp the truth that He and His Father are one. Love and joy have become the characteristics of Christian feeling rather than vindictiveness and cringing terror.

At the same time, the 'modern' position has exhibited grave defects. We have yet to see a consistent and valid presentation of Christian truth

on the new basis. The pitiful attempt made a generation ago under the name of the 'New Theology' was little more than the shallow expression of certain instinctive feelings. Right enough in themselves, they needed a valid philosophical basis if they were to guide the Church of the future, and, from the Christian point of view, the whole position was wrecked on its inadequate Christology and its lack of a positive explanation of the death of Jesus. The Church still needs a *thinker*, who will give us a sound and convincing 'hell-less' theology.

The Church has lost, too, much of its distinctive ethic. With the removal of the traditional sanction, a purely selfish mind no longer sees any ground for restraint or impulse to positive righteousness. We have become 'broad-minded,' and, in our anxiety to avoid hypocritical censoriousness, we have tended to blur the line dividing right from wrong. We insist that 'perfect love casteth out fear'—but we forget or ignore the adjective. We have lost the sense of sin.

The failure to give sin its true place in Christian preaching was one of the worst features of the old position. It was dreaded because it led to hell, and not for its own sake. The Church, generally speaking, failed to realize that sin is the big thing and hell the small one, and that the abolition of the latter should do little to diminish the horror of the former. Sin is *not* merely a theological conception; it is an appalling fact of experience common to all religions. For every form of religion presents an ideal relation between the worshipper and the object of worship, and sin is anything in human life which, directly or indirectly, temporarily or permanently, interrupts or frustrates the maintenance or achievement of that ideal. In an ethical religion such as Christianity it is inevitably related to, though not confined to, practical conduct. Unless and until the fact and horror of sin are brought home to the conscience of mankind, there can be no hope of an adequate recovery in the spiritual life of the modern world. How can this be done?

Pending the reconstruction of our theology by competent experts, two considerations may be

suggested. The first is the fact of retribution. The chain of cause and effect forms one of the basic and eternal laws by which the world as we know it is governed. 'They sow the wind,' said Hosea, 'and they shall reap the whirlwind.' 'God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap' is St. Paul's dictum. Prophet and Apostle are here at one, and their principle is fully attested by the facts of life. It is true that later action may modify the course of events, so becoming itself a 'cause,' but the possibility of such modification is limited. In the last resort, the law of causation is the basis on which physical nature exists and functions, and it is the foundation of all history, individual, social, and political. We recognize the validity and immutability of 'laws' in the material world; we must also recognize that the 'laws' of the spiritual world, though more subtle and complicated, are equally valid and equally immutable. It is one of the supreme perils of this age that we tend to ignore this claim. Much of our popular literature and dramatic entertainment owes its appeal to the doctrine that 'everything will come out right in the end,' no matter how much evil may have been committed. Prophets like George Eliot and Thomas Hardy are read only by the 'highbrow.' This lie *must* be scotched; we *must* get back to something like the old Hebrew belief in sin as a living and powerful reality, let loose in the world by a man's deed, which must sooner or later come back on the doer—must, in fact, find him out. The world will always prefer the smooth talk of the man who says 'Peace, peace,' where there is no peace, but in the long run it will listen to the preacher who fearlessly states the truth of the utterly inexorable law of retribution. We *must* faithfully make men realize that they cannot admit selfishness, falsehood, hypocrisy, greed, or hatred, into life and soul, and still hope for happiness and for success in the highest sense of the term. We *must* bring them to see that they cannot gamble on the chance of escaping the penalty, for themselves and for others—let us not forget the others. There is no question of chance; it is a certainty. *In all God's universe there is no such thing as being 'let-off.'*

As far as it goes, then, the Indian doctrine of *karma* is universally valid. But, if we stopped there,

we should ignore the very foundation on which the whole edifice of Christian truth is built. We are thus led to our second point—the fact and method of forgiveness. The subject is a vast one, with countless different aspects; here we can glance only at the light it throws on the nature of sin. Let us first, then, clear our minds of the popular fallacy that forgiveness means the remission of a penalty. It does not; that, as we have seen, is unthinkable, and God would not be God if He interfered to save men from the consequences inherent in their attitude and deeds. But even that inherent penalty is not the worst result of sin; from the Christian point of view its supreme horror lies in the breach of the personal relations between the child and his infinitely loving Father. This *is* remediable, though all experience tends to show that an 'atonement' made from the human side is futile.

The Christian gospel is unique in that it presents an atonement made from the divine side. It depicts God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, and insists that He Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree. In other words, God Himself accepts the responsibility for initiating a remedy for the remediable effect of sin. Nor is that atonement a light or easy thing; its price was—and is—the Cross of the Lamb which was slain from the foundation of the world. It is here, for the first time, that we are faced with the meaning of sin. We may contemplate the most lurid pictures of hell that ever mediæval theology or oriental imagination have drawn, we may see in the experience of a Hosea or in the teaching of a Jeremiah the intense pain of love rejected, but these things pale into insignificance when we kneel before the Cross of Calvary. At its worst, hell would be but the suffering of the infinitesimal; sin involves the broken heart of the infinite. This is not the place to attempt a soteriology, or any other formal theological doctrine. The truth of the matter, as revealed by the Cross, is this: *Sin is as much more terrible than hell as God is greater than man.*

O Love of God! O sin of Man!

In this dread act your strength is tried,
And victory remains with love:

Jesus, our Lord, is crucified.

Can our preaching bring this home to men?

Christianity in Action.

Aspects of Religious Education in Canada and the United States.

By A. J. WILLIAM MYERS, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN
HARTFORD SEMINARY FOUNDATION, HARTFORD, CONN.

RELIGIOUS education is essential in free countries for it implies the development of the finest character but carried to its highest reach in loyalty and devotion to God.

This culture of human persons is certainly the most delightful and sacred of undertakings. The nursery of the religious life must ever be the home and neighbourhood. Anything the Church and other agencies can do is to supplement (or counteract) what is taking place there. The real tragedy is when there is little stimulus to the development of sterling character, no vital religious living, in these places where people most truly live.

As life matures contacts widen until they include business, the nation, and the world. If ever there was a time when young people and men and women needed the steadying and the inspiration of religion it is now.

The work of the churches in Great Britain has been a blessing to the world, and all of us in the overseas Dominions and thousands in the United States look to the homeland for leadership and guidance.

But in these matters, fortunately, there is complete reciprocity. It is always of value to know what the trends are in other countries.

Perhaps the best that can be done in this respect in a short article is to mention a few developments that may be of interest to the general reader.

1. *The Director of Religious Education.* While schools existed for training church workers much earlier the directorate was not recognized as a profession until the early years of this century.

The standard preparation is a full college course (four years, preferably with some courses in education) and at least two years in a graduate school of religious education, leading to the degree of Master of Arts, Master of Religious Education, or Doctor of Philosophy.

The courses include Bible, Psychology (educational and child psychology and mental adjustments), Social Science (family welfare, case work) and Education (principles of religious education, principles of teaching, materials of curriculum, history of education, play and dramatics, organization, and specialized work with various age groups, including crafts). There are advanced seminars to

meet special needs. A good deal of emphasis is put on Field Work, done under observation by the staff, and carried on under actual conditions in church, social settlement, Y.M. and Y.W.C.A. Camps, and so on.

These graduates are employed by churches as an additional member of the staff whose chief function is to minister to the whole church in its total educational programme. Churches with directors are usually busy seven days a week. On Sunday the older classes probably meet for from one to two hours before church; the nursery, kindergarten, and sometimes primary children often have their session during church service. Various groups of young people meet in the late afternoon and evening.

Through the week various groups and committees come together in connection with their work, or for games, hikes, and other kinds of recreation. Choirs of various ages meet for practice.

Three very important parts of the director's work are the stimulation and enrichment of the teachers and officers. This calls for constant watchfulness for helpful materials and also for meetings with various groups. One of the most telling services of the director is through personal contact with the people, particularly with the youth. They come to the director freely and talk very intimately. Being a confidant (who never betrays them) the director may be a real influence in character development. A third function is to know the best materials available in this broadest field of human endeavour. New materials—books, courses, units of study, pictures, films and slides, experiments, should all be known. This in itself is quite a task in a department where so much is being produced and that is moving as rapidly as is religious education.

Of course, the minister should be thoroughly trained in religious education and should be an educator at heart. Most seminaries now have at least one Chair (and some have two or more) in religious education. But ministers in moderately large churches have so many other duties that they give little time or attention to the day by day face to face processes of education, and this though every

one knows that the chief increase comes through the two educational agencies—the home and the Sunday school.

The value of a director cannot be overestimated. In nine cases out of ten, once a minister has had one he cannot think of getting on without such a co-worker. Three out of four employed directors are women and so supplement in a wonderful way the work of a man. Of course a few big churches have a multiple staff with, say, an associate minister, director, minister of music, and social workers, and probably the services of a psychiatrist. A few churches are beginning to realize that their work is to *minister* to people and not merely to preach, however important preaching is as one element in that ministry.

Only a small proportion of the congregations will able to call a director do so, and the salaries paid are small compared with that of the minister. Church people do not yet see that while thousands of pounds are spent and ought to be spent on agriculture and animal culture, on health and housing, and that all these vital concerns ought to be in the hands only of those best fitted by education, experience, and character to direct them, the same, or greater, care should be taken to provide for the nurture of the highest moral and spiritual character development. They are too content to leave this, as far as the church is concerned, in the hands of willing but often untrained people who are given little help or even encouragement in their great and important work. The church as a whole has not yet learned that character develops and matures according to its own nature—first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear—and that each one needs the understanding care and nurture of intelligent leaders. In a few cases, two or more smaller churches have combined to employ a director. This plan is rich in possibilities as yet unattained.

2. *Adult Religious Education.* The tendency is for people to think of religious education and the Sunday school as work with children. This, of course, is a serious error. If religion is an attitude or quality of life and essential to the best life it must include all ages. If there are gaps in enrolment, that reveals a weakness in the programme and work of the church.

In recent years many things have contributed to the sense of need of education by adults. Some of these are the Workers' Education Association. Here men and women sought out opportunity for study. Extension courses at colleges, summer sessions and summer schools attracted thousands

of people including teachers, administrators of school systems, laymen, and ministers, until it has become natural to think even of adults and educated people going to school. In the depression with millions out of work all sorts of classes have been available, and people revealed a great thirst for knowledge and skills. Dancing, gardening, crafts, diet, home nursing, poultry raising, horticulture, and all sorts of practical subjects are very popular, but there is also demand for art, music, literature, languages, dramatics, and the so-called more cultural subjects.

Then there has come the discovery that adults can learn as well as children, that they need education just as much, and that when it meets their needs, they are as keen about it. The church has always proclaimed its faith that men and women should continue their studies and 'keep the mind renewed.' The Bible class and mid-week prayer meeting were the chief means provided, though the former often became a preaching service and the latter an experience meeting.

Now there is a growing interest among adults in the churches. One of the commonest forms of this is seen in the Parents' Class. A number of good books have already appeared. Parents of young children are accustomed to getting help on all matters of child care from doctors, nurses, and dietitians so they are in an educable mood. One of their real problems is how to answer children's questions about God and religion. Many of them are too honest merely to fall back on traditional answers which are often evasions or are out of keeping with modern science. There are also moral and behaviour situations which they do not know how to handle. Questions of children's reading and many other things come up. It seems so natural that groups should meet and consider these and similar fascinating and vital questions under the guidance of religion. The time of meeting depends on the group. Some assemble at the regular Sunday school hour, some as 'Fireside Clubs' on Sunday evening, and others through the week.

There are all sorts of adult groups who wish to meet more or less informally to discuss some of the many interesting questions that are confronting the world to-day, such as: peace and war, race relations, world religions, religious problems, new books, art, music, social issues, marriage, and the home.

Of course most churches already have a good many adults, at least in informal groups, whose work is full of educational possibilities. For

example, choirs, missionary societies, sessions and deacons' boards, and all sorts of committees with responsibilities are in excellent learning situations. Choirs may do little more than have drill rehearsals. But with other direction they may study music and worship and find it most stimulating and enlightening. Missionary societies may carry through routine programmes or may carry on their work in a way that is ever so much more educative. It will be a great gain if through adult education increased attention can be directed to the need of religious stimulus and guidance for all children and youth. Two lines of development then are being attempted : to increase the educative quality in work already being done ; and to meet new needs as they arise or are discovered among men and women in these perplexing days.

3. *Vacation Church Schools.* About twenty-five years ago the first vacation schools were conducted. For a couple of months in summer the churches are comparatively empty and children are out of school, 'Empty churches and idle children' caught the attention of leaders. The movement spread with great rapidity, and now vacation schools are found almost everywhere and have been adopted in many mission lands.

These schools are held for two, three, or four weeks—a few perhaps longer. Four weeks is the general aim. The sessions are usually from 9-12 every morning from Monday through Friday. This gives a total of sixty hours which is a good deal more than the ordinary Sunday school provides in a whole year. But the vacation school has another advantage as to time. Three hours a day for five consecutive days is a block of time in which a reasonable amount of work can be done. In the ordinary Sunday school the time—a scant hour—is not only broken up but is separated from the next session by a whole week.

The organization is very simple. There is a principal or director and as many teachers as needed. In small schools there are two sections, children under nine and juniors, aged nine and up. Larger schools have a wider spread of ages and more departments. A few schools have a group of adolescents. There is much more freedom of movement and work than is possible on Sunday and almost all schools are centres of intense, purposeful activity.

Each group soon decides as to what it shall undertake to do. One class of under-privileged children undertook to build a Hall of Fame and select its own heroes. This led to a study of biographies and to deciding on how to judge

between candidates. These keen young minds were not misled by superficial standards such as money or fame. They came to see that what was significant was a quality of life and service. As they studied and got the opinions of others and selected people—one only from any one nation—they also designed and built a miniature hall and modelled their heroes in soap. Dramatic incidents in these lives were dramatized and charts and posters made to visualize the service each had performed.

A group of Primary children in a great city made a study of wheat. When they began, all they knew was that bread was bought in a store. Starting here they found different kinds of loaves and different ways bread is used, making very lovely picture books. They made models of loaves and of slices of toast. It was a great discovery to find and handle flour and to bake biscuits. So the process went on, and the greatest thrill was visiting a farm, seeing wheat growing, being cut and threshed ; and also visiting a grist mill. Deep in their nature was learned that back of the loaf and flour and farmer and miller was 'the sun and the Father's will.' Their dramatization was very moving. One understood better why Jesus so often referred to 'our daily bread.'

It is easily seen that such a unit of study is full of possible creative work, and the children fill every moment with intelligent reading, painting, constructing, and worshipping. The worship is one of the richest parts of these schools. When children are happy and active creating something their spirits are very close to the experience of worship, and all through their work leaders take the opportunity, when the occasion arises, of bringing it, quite naturally, to consciousness. The worship services of course grow out of their work. After, for example, some knowledge of the process of baking how full the expression of gratitude and the desire that others may have bread.

The day's programme varies according to need. The following is not an actual time-table but it will indicate something of the general scheme : 9-9.45 the children take up eagerly the work where they left off last day, the teachers mingling among them, helping and counselling as required ; 9.45-10.15 department assembly where each group tells what it has done and receives suggestions ; this leads to unification of interest and to natural expression in a service of worship ; 10.15-10.45 refreshment, rest, and quiet singing ; 10.45-11.15 play and story telling, pictures, all bearing on the unit of work ; 11.15-12 the work continued and plans made for next day.

The cost is very little. Usually the director is paid, for she must give a great deal of time, beginning not less than a week before the opening day. Most of the supplies can be secured from waste materials in homes and shops. For that purpose the director makes out a list and establishes a depot well in advance of the school.

The vacation church school affords an excellent opportunity for co-operation among churches. Large churches in the city unite in their effort because so many of their people are out of town; village and country churches combine and so have larger schools and the combined talent of ministers and people. The question is asked, 'Will children attend these schools in vacation time?' The universal experience is that they flock to them and the attendance is over ninety per cent. But the leaders must understand and must work.

4. *The Educational Process.* Schooling may be largely what the teacher does, lecturing, quizzing, and so on; but education is what takes place in the life of the pupil. The educational process is not an attempt to do something to persons, nor for them, but with them. Among the fruits of religious education are fineness of spirit, sensitiveness to the needs and aspirations of others, goodwill to others, and skill in promoting the common good; and whole-hearted devotion to God.

Qualities sought in a religious educator, then, are skill in stimulating persons to seek, to aspire, to explore; ability to guide the questing spirit into fruitful ventures; and a spirit which helps them to love God. The process then is not one of instruction and indoctrination but of awakening,

stimulating, of freeing and guiding growing persons into increasing richness of life. The best public schools are already operating on this philosophy of education and no longer hold that instruction and information is really education. The churches must not trail along far in the rear. Their place is in the van.

Life is fascinating to children and it is also very difficult. Religious education has a magnificent opportunity to minister to all ages, but to do so it must deal with life where the people now are. If one asks for a good example of such teaching the answer is plain. Jesus was such a Teacher. His materials were the everyday experiences of His pupils—sheep, wheat, lilies, sparrows, fish, and every-day occupations, fears, sorrows, hopes, and joys. The occasion was the needs He met. He is still the Master, the Teacher.

Of course there are many books on each of these points, especially the last two. Dr. Harry Monroe has a book on *The Director*; Jessie Charter's *Young Adults and the Church* is suggestive, and Gleason's is a practical handbook. Blair's book on *The Vacation Church School* is one of the most recent (New York Council of Churches). *The Unit on Wheat (or Bread)*, by Miss Rosemary Roorbach, is obtainable in multigraphed form from the New York Council of Churches. *Adventuring with Kwo Ying*, by Myers and Vaill, reports the unit of work carried on by a high school group. It is published by the Episcopal Church, New York. My own book, *Teaching Religion Creatively* (Revell) treats of the educative process. These, of course, are but a few samples from a large and rapidly growing literature.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Bells of Peace.

BY THE REVEREND D. T. DAVIES, M.A., B.D., LONDON.

'In that day shall there be upon the bells . . . HOLY UNTO THE LORD.'—Zec 14²⁰ (R.V.).

ARMISTICE DAY is again near at hand, and this year it will have a new and added meaning, because we

are just now rejoicing in a new kind of peace—a peace without a war to precede it.

Things looked pretty dark during those closing days of September—trenches being dug up in the parks, and people lining up in rows for their gas-masks. In some cases, girls and boys were already being conveyed from crowded city areas to be out of danger, and join with their country cousins in school and games. Then, with the dawn of the last day of September, we learned with joy that our

Prime Minister was on his way home from Munich with the glad news of peace and no war. As his car drew near to his official residence in Whitehall, the bells of Westminster Abbey rang out the welcome of a grateful people.

By the way, bells have always played a great part in the celebration of peace. Those of you who, during the holidays, visited the Glasgow Exhibition, will, perhaps, have noticed that on the top of the 'Peace Pavilion' there was a belfry, from which a peal of bells could be heard, at intervals, each day.

Now, let me tell you a secret about them. In the first place, they were a present from a firm far famed for the making of bells. As you know, bells are not really *made*, they are *cast*, that is to say, molten metal is poured into a mould shaped like a bell. When the metal has cooled, it is taken out of the mould, just as mother does with the jelly, and so we have our bell.

On the day when all was ready to cast the bells, a group of people were invited to the foundry. They were persons held in high honour because of their service to the cause of peace among the nations. At a given signal, when the hot, fluid metal was being poured in, they threw into it various and valuable coins of silver which soon melted into the whole. As a result, there is precious silver embedded in the heart of these 'bells of peace.' They peal out their message in clear silvery tones because of the good treasure which lies in the centre of them.

On Sunday, when we hear the bells ringing, calling us to worship God, I wonder whether we all know that church bells were rung at the first to frighten away evil spirits. This old-fashioned plan cannot have worked well, because the evil spirits are back in our world to-day, and they cause us much trouble—evil spirits, such as greed, hate, envy, bullying, and cruelty.

The only way to deal with this black brood is to have within our hearts that stronger, finer spirit of goodness which has always proved more than a match for them. With such a spirit at the centre, just like the silver in 'the bells of peace,' we may be as bells ringing true to the call and claim of goodwill, friendliness, and charity. All girls and boys can chime in here. You may not all be clever, but never mind, there is open to you a gentleness of character whereby the least can be truly great. There need be nothing in the way of any girl or boy to be and to do her or his best. The Lord Jesus Christ, as in all other things, is our Leader here, and it is He who will help us to do what is

good and right, so that we shall be peacemakers in His world. In His hands it is our honour to be as bells to

Ring out false pride in place and blood,
The civic slander and the spite ;
Ring in the love of truth and right,
Ring in the common love of good.

The Noble Order of St. Andrew.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A., LISBON.

'He [Andrew] first findeth his own brother . . . and he brought him to Jesus.'—Jn 1st.

In St. Giles' Cathedral in Edinburgh there is a beautiful chapel: it is the chapel of the Knights of the Thistle. That is Scotland's chief order of knighthood, like the Order of the Garter in England.

Now the Order of the Thistle is also called the Order of St. Andrew, for St. Andrew is the patron saint of Scotland, and the jewel of the Order bears a figure of St. Andrew on his cross. Legend says that St. Andrew preached Christ in Greece and Russia, and was crucified on an X-shaped cross. In the fourth century a Greek monk called Regulus brought the bones of St. Andrew to Scotland, and landed in the east of Fife, where a church was built and a town grew up round it called St. Andrews. Scotland adopted St. Andrew as her patron saint, and his cross as her national flag, and when James I. founded a Scottish Order of Knighthood he called it the Order of St. Andrew.

Now the legends about St. Andrew may, or may not, be true. We don't know. But what we do know about him is that he was the first missionary of our Lord Jesus Christ; that, when he had found Jesus for himself, he went and found his brother and brought him to Jesus. 'He first findeth his own brother Simon . . . and he brought him to Jesus.'

I don't know whether St. Andrew's bones ever came to Scotland, but I would like to think that his spirit is in Scottish folk. I know it is in some, and I want to tell you of two who were, in the very finest sense, knights of the Order of St. Andrew.

The first was a little Glasgow girl. Like many poor children she had to be something of a little mother and a little more, as well as a little sister. One day she was carrying her little brother to the park and he was nearly as big as herself. A friend of mine spoke to her, and said, 'You've got a heavy burden there.' She replied finely, 'It's no a burden; it's ma wee brither!' Reckoned in pounds avoirdupois, and in terms of her slender arms, it was a heavy burden; but because behind her muscles

was the strength of a loving heart she could carry it gallantly and gladly, not a burden, but her brother. A little Knight of the Order of St. Andrew.

The second was a little Dundee boy. It was a bitter morning of frost. The ground was iron and the wind was icy. A bunch of boys were gathered for a morning meeting, and as they were before their time and the door wasn't open, they were doing a bit of drill to keep themselves warm. A passer-by watched them for a while, and noticing one of the bigger boys without a coat, spoke to him. 'Aren't you cold without a coat?' 'No, I'm no.' 'Would you be the better of your coat?' 'Mebbe I wud, and mebbe I wudna.' 'Have you not got a coat?' 'Aye, I've a coat.' 'Well where is it?' 'Ma wee brither's got it on.' Another Knight of the Order of St. Andrew. He didn't feel cold because he had taken care that his little brother should be warm. Do you remember how once Jesus was tired and hungry by a well-side long ago and how He forgot His own hunger and weariness in His concern for a poor woman whose heart was tired and hungry? 'I have meat to eat that ye know not of,' He said to the disciples; and the Dundee laddie had a source of warmth and comfort the kindly passer-by knew not of.

That sort of thing is the best proof that any one has found and come into living touch with Jesus Christ. He came seeking His brothers to bring them to God; and His spirit in any one sets them off at once on the same task. That is Christianity. That sends missionaries abroad, and moves people at home to care for the poor, to bring warmth to cold hearts and comfort to the comfortless, and never feels these things a burden because 'it's ma brither.'

There are only sixteen Knights of the Thistle; and you and I can never have our names on its roll, its jewels on our breast, or a stall in its Chapel. But we can all be members of the noble order of St. Andrew and have its jewel in our heart; for its jewel is Brotherliness and its motto is not 'Nemo me impune lacessit'—which is a prickly motto well befitting a thistle!—but, 'Andrew first findeth his own brother . . . and he brought him to Jesus.'

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Forgiveness.

'So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.'—Mt 18³⁵.

'There are some wrongs that no one ought to forgive,' says one of the characters in a modern

novel, 'and I shall be a villain on the day I shake that man's hand.' This is the view of forgiveness which finds a home in many Christian breasts, and it is not uncommon among a certain class of Christian writers. It is thought to be a mean and almost impossible thing to forgive certain injuries, especially of a bitter nature. Such an idea, however, though it might pass among the ancient heathen, whose religion often consisted in doing the greatest amount of good to their friends and the greatest mischief to their enemies, can claim no place in the heart of a true Christian. We are not to render 'evil for evil, or railing for railing: but contrariwise blessing.'

We know how Jesus manifested this beautiful grace, both by precept and example. He gave it a large space in His moral teaching, particularly in His Sermon on the Mount. He put the matter strongly before His disciples in the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant, who had been forgiven a debt of ten thousand talents by the king, but nevertheless imprisoned a fellow-servant who owed him the small sum of a hundred pence. After telling the wretched fate of this unmerciful servant, Jesus added, 'So shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.' He did not fail moreover to put His precepts into practice. The time came when He was to be tried by them. What would He do? His enemies looked at Him with wild, wicked eyes, struck at Him with their merciless hands, leaped and roared round the Cross like ravening bulls, flashing ferocity. But in the midst there escaped from His lips a cry, soft and low, yet heard in heaven, heard above the curses of the crowd, heard above the whole world, and vibrating still through the ages—'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' Beside this marvellous example of love, how mean and unchristian is our spirit of revenge, our touchiness, our resentment, our uncharitableness!

Let us see that our forgiveness of others is genuine, for it is one of those graces liable to be counterfeited. It may be that we only desire to be quit of the offender, or we wish to appear magnanimous before our fellow-men. In various ways, indeed, by mere empty words or light performances, we may corrupt the grace of forgiveness and bring contempt upon it. One characteristic of genuine forgiveness is its activity, manifesting itself in forbearing words and deeds towards the offender. It is not sufficient to bear no malice or ill-will to him—we must meet him with a spirit of goodwill and generosity, and show him active kindness. Otherwise our forgiveness

may be nothing more than a plausible indifference.

But granting all this, let us not make the mistake of confounding this tender grace with indulgence. To forgive in cases where the offender is impenitent does not mean that we are to take no notice of the wrong done, especially if it be of a serious nature, and act towards him as if he had never done it. This would not be kindness, for it would not only leave him hardened in his sin, but would be an encouragement to further evil. It would put a premium on wrong-doing, and would break down moral boundaries. God has given us a keen sense of wrong, a disgust at meanness, a contempt of falsehood, a hatred of injustice and oppression, an indignation against cruelty and inhumanity. It is right that these feelings should come into exercise, so that forgiveness may not become a weak sentiment, smoothing over the sin and making it of little account. Hence we are called upon to strive patiently with the offender, if by doing so we can make him sensible of the wrong and worthy of forgiveness. This requires a large amount of self-denial, but Jesus enjoins it. 'If thy brother sin against thee,' He said, 'go show him his fault between thee and him alone.' Whatever effect this treatment may have upon him, even though it prove futile, leaving him angry and determined, we must still pray for him, still show him a multitude of kindnesses, still transmute his evil by good. However great his impenitence or hostility, it can never absolve us from the command of our Master, 'Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you.' How many troubles and vexations might be prevented, not only in the Christian Church but everywhere in society, if the servants of Christ would act on this principle, meeting all wrong with right, all injury with the spirit of Christ!

Let us not think that this is weakness, and that resentment and threats mean power. Many people have this idea, fancying that they show strength when they threaten those who have in the least wronged or annoyed them. Some nations, too, think they manifest potency and efficiency by aggression and violence, satanic savagery, unspeakable outrages on innocent towns and villages, and the persistent dominance of brute force. The very opposite, however, is the case. The greatest power and influence accompany those who subdue passion and show forbearance. Violence and revenge are weak and paltry; forbearance is great-minded, powerful, and influential. To take a city by force

is a little thing, but to overcome by reason and kindness is the greatest of victories, and shows divine strength. Let history unroll its long annals and tell us who are life's victors! They are not those who have made themselves terrible by force, but those who have patiently accepted wrongs in the spirit of Christ; not the pitiless persecutors of the Christian Church, but the martyrs, who died with words of mercy on their lips; not the mocking crowds around Cavalry, but the Son of Man, whom they reviled and crucified, and who prayed for their forgiveness. Even so, if we would conquer, we must eschew every act of retaliation or revenge which is only intended to gratify ourselves.

Nor should we harbour any secret desire that God may avenge. To 'forgive' an offender, and yet cherish a reserve that God may punish him, is only partial forgiveness. It is easy to grant such a thing. How many Christians say, 'I will not injure him, for God will deal with him, though it may be some years yet.' And so they watch for any losses and reverses he may have, any griefs and adversities, and they feel a secret satisfaction if these things come. They would not hurt him themselves, but they exult in the thought that God may do so. This is not the divine spirit exhibited by our Lord and Master—it is nothing less than a malevolent feeling under the guise of tenderness. *Jesus not only forgave His crucifiers, but prayed His Father to forgive them also.*

One great motive towards a forgiving spirit lies in the fact that God has made it a condition of His forgiving us. 'If ye forgive not men their trespasses,' said Christ, 'neither will your heavenly Father forgive your trespasses.' If we do not forgive, we break the bridge over which we must pass to the throne of mercy. If we are proud and unrelenting, cherishing resentment and making no allowances, overbearing and exacting the uttermost farthing, we have reason to fear for God's forgiveness of us. With what measure we mete, it shall be measured to us again. This is brought to our continual remembrance in the Lord's Prayer, when we ask God to forgive us as we have forgiven our fellow-men. As Shakespeare truly says:

Why, all the souls that were were forfeit once;
And He that might the vantage best have took,
Found out the remedy. How would you be,
If He, which is the top of judgment, should
But judge you as you are? O! think on that,
And mercy then will breathe within your lips,
Like man new made.¹

¹ J. W. Jack, *After His Likeness*, 100.

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

The Release of Barabbas.

BY THE REVEREND LEIGH WALLER, B.A.,
BÜRROWBRIDGE, BRIDGWATER.

'Release unto us Barabbas.'—Lk 23¹⁸.

It was not necessary for the writers of the Gospels to tell the story of the last days of Jesus with any literary flourish. The tenseness of the atmosphere was conveyed by setting the passions of men and the actions of Jesus in a simple setting of events.

As the machinery of justice, such as it was, moved slowly on, the contrast between Jesus and the rest of those present at the trial became more and more vivid. A lonely figure was facing His accusers, and by His silent attitude was judging them—their prejudices, their motives, their mood. The relief is all the sharper when we observe how the innocence of Jesus was plain to the unimpassioned. Pilate was convinced of it. So also, later, that stolid Roman soldier on duty at the crosses was stirred to make the impulsive comment: 'Certainly this was a righteous man!'

Impatient with the evasions of Pilate, the temper of the crowd rises until at last it finds unrestrained expression in the cry: 'Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas!' That spontaneous shout showed their mood. (How often men stand revealed by their impulses!) The people had thronged Him, they had cheered Him, they had been His bulwark against unscrupulous leaders, but their hearts were not in tune with Him, and the occasion revealed the truth about their natures.

This was not a judgment of Jesus; it was His judgment of men. The cry: 'Away with this man!' was an attempt to stifle the voice of conscience. It was the way the crowd chose to defend itself against Him. Men became aware of a terrible gulf between themselves and their motives on the one hand, and Jesus on the other. In a mood of unreason and fear, and the desire to escape from the demands of Jesus, and to deafen their ears to the call of God through Him, they cried in self-protection that Jesus should be crucified. Panic and impulse had bared their hearts. They were in an inflamed mood and so they shouted their verdict before the trial was concluded.

Obviously they had not stopped to think about the release of Barabbas. Upon reflection they might have altered their minds, for it was a curious preference. Personal admiration for Barabbas was not the inspiration of the cry for him. He

may conceivably have had the gay and attractive personality that some criminals affect. No one was thinking of that. It is plain that at that moment men felt like Barabbas in their hearts. The world of the crowd was just then ruled by the passion and violence that characterized Barabbas.

That Barabbas mood is a recurring mood. Again and again it has gripped the world. It is the mood of fear, intolerance, violence, destruction. It rejects principles and fires impulses. It stands for the mass against the man. In many ages it has caught the world as a fever might catch a man for whom no medical skill is available, and it has run a virulent course and very slowly subsided. A contemporary publicist expresses the idea in these words: 'If anything has been clear in the history of Europe this last twenty-five years, it is that passions, fanaticisms, prejudices weigh certainly as much as interests in the shaping of events. It is not a new thing: Mahomet, the Crusades, the Inquisition, the French Revolution, the Terror, Napoleon, the bitter Nationalisms that have riven Europe, the Moscow purges, the war in Spain, the ruthless cruelty with which Spaniard can torture Spaniard, the ferocities of the young Nazi bullies, the Jew baiting, the beatings, tortures, prisons, concentration camps . . . all teach the same lesson in one form or another.' Barabbas has been released in men's hearts.

This inflammation of the Barabbas mood in our own day reveals itself also in regard to religion, and the more the truth of Christianity is proclaimed the keener may the opposition that persecutes, or distorts Christianity, become. Direct denial and persecution of Christianity are possibly less deadly than distortion. The Church has often thriven on persecution; the faithful have cleared their minds of cant and their hearts of worldly ambition. Far worse than frontal attack on the faith is distortion of it. Anti-God decrees in Russia might have had a purging effect on a Church deeply and disgracefully involved in the world, in political movements and tyrannies. In themselves they were little more than disestablishment. Far more serious to the cause of Christianity was the indirect propaganda of cartoons, drama, museum exhibits, and the like. This distortion is particularly noticeable in Germany. Here is a high-sounding distortion of the Beatitudes. 'Blessed is he who bears his sufferings manfully; he will find the strength never to become discouraged. Blessed is he who at all times is a good comrade; he will succeed in the world. Blessed are those who keep peace with their compatriots; they do God's will.' An so on.

These are supposed to be more virile sayings, but between this religion infected with nationalism and the paganism which is the worship of elemental physical forces there is not much to choose. Both despise and reject the universal application of Christian principles of love and service. In some countries, such as our own, there is no such widespread indoctrination of paganism into Christianity, there is little attempt to distort Christianity deliberately. There is indifference, and there is acceptance of low standards, which are both deadly enough. The greatest danger is, however, from world forces which may sweep through lands hitherto unaffected. The world is in a certain mood which is in part aggressively and blatantly pagan, and sometimes merely a muddled or indifferent attitude to religion. In either case the kingdom of Barabbas is helped forward. 'Away with this man,' has a logical sequence. Whether men deliberately shout for Christ to be put out of the way, or passively accept His removal, the outcome is the same: the release of Barabbas in their hearts.

And when Barabbas rules, the disciples of Jesus are often possessed by the spirit of defeatism. Where were they when Barabbas was first released? There they may still be when Barabbas is released in men's hearts to-day. Dark periods of paganism are disconcerting to many disciples. The opposing forces seem so many that the campaign is often lost before it is started. Pessimism and defeatism will remain with us and may become chronic unless we remember the whole of the story. Barabbas was released, so we may suppose. The crowd had its way—for Christ was crucified.

But that is our glory. That very fact is our inspiration. It was on the Cross that Jesus proved that love could remain unbroken in its conflict with sin. Hatred, evil, cruelty, bitter enmity, these nailed Him to a cross. The body of Jesus was broken, there were nails in His hands and feet; but He still loved. He was spit upon, offered vinegar in His distress; but He still loved. They put a crown of thorns on His head, He heard them jeering in His ears; but He still loved. His disciples watched fearfully at a distance, scared into cowardice, and He passed through an agony of loneliness; but He still loved. Then when the torment was fiercest came His cry: 'Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.' After those passions had burnt themselves out the love of Jesus for men lived on.

It still lives. It must be the inspiration of our attack to-day. We must look at the Cross and

be inspired by unconquered love. Too long have we watched the forces of brutality, persecution and distortion at work and have thought that they were winning. The army of Barabbas has had so many warriors that we have been overtaken by terror.

To us the Cross represents the love of God; it declares the power of love over the worst in men. It is the triumph of Christ over Barabbas, and if it is to a world that chooses Barabbas rather than Jesus to which we have to go, that triumph must be our motive force. When the world demands the release of Barabbas and all the unholy forces for which he stands, our answer is the merit of the holy Cross.

Christian! dost thou see them
On the holy ground,
How the powers of darkness
Compass thee around?
Christian! up and smite them,
Counting gain but loss;
Smite them by the merit
Of the holy Cross.

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

O Come, O Come, Immanuel!

'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned.'—Is 40^{1, 2}.

To-day we are standing in the gateway of the Advent season; and I wish that the authentic thrill of Advent could lay some deep spell upon our spirits.

What does Advent mean? It means the glory of the coming of the Lord. It means the breaking in of the divine into human history, of the supernatural into the natural. It means a sense of something great impending from the side of heaven.

The world is blundering in a morass of sin and sorrow now, and men lose hope completely. And people have their personal problems too: and there are brave faces which hide sore hearts, and secret wounds that ache, and a restless new every morning; and life is much harder for some than any who see them can imagine, and even God seems to have forgotten to be gracious; but sometimes through the darkness shines a light, and the troubled heart grows calm again. 'Be still, my soul; for God will surely come.' That is Advent.

I wish we could all recapture the authentic thrill of this Advent time. But words are poor things to

convey it: it needs the wings of music. Some of us have listened to Sir Walford Davies' broadcast talk on 'Melodies of Christendom.' 'We want to help you to catch the Advent spirit,' he said; and then his singers sang—sang first one of those mighty melodies of Bach in which the passionate, desperate yearning of generations and centuries of men have been caught and concentrated, sang next of the joy when midnight turns to morning:

'Wake, awake! for night is flying,
The watchmen on the heights are crying,
'Awake, Jerusalem, at last!'

I think that songs and hymns and music can carry us nearer to the burning heart of the Advent message than all the sermons and discourses in the world. And so I hope that what I cannot do may be accomplished for some when we sing our final hymn, that great cry of the souls of men which the Church for eight hundred years has lifted up to heaven:

O come, O come, Immanuel,
And ransom captive Israel,
That mourns in lonely exile here
Until the Son of God appear—

and then—the great crashing chords of triumphant reassurance:

Rejoice! rejoice! Immanuel
Shall come to thee, O Israel.

That is the spirit of our text. 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God.' I know, of course, that the Advent gospel has another side to it. I know there is a day of the Lord that is like a thief in the night. I have read the Word of God, and heard its great commission—'Cry aloud! Spare not! Lift up thy voice like a trumpet!' I have heard the terrible, startling urgency that was in the voice of Jesus when He tried to shake men awake from their sleep, lest they should be found with loins ungirt and lamps unlit when at midnight came the cry. But I know also this, that beneath all the drums and thunder of the Advent Symphony there is a deeper undertone, the music of the peace of God that passeth understanding. 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God.'

The true comfort of Christ is a strong, bracing, reinforcing thing. It is like a wind to a boat that has been becalmed. It is like the gift of a job to a man who has been for years out of work. It is like the clasp of a friend's hand in a time of need. This is certainly the root of the word 'comfort' in the New Testament; and when Jesus speaks of the Holy Spirit as the 'Comforter,' He is really giving a

promise that God will stand by a man in the day of his need, and brace his heart and nerve his arm, and make him more than conqueror. I should be failing you if I attempted for one moment to minimize or to conceal the essential hardness of Christianity: it is going to be hard to the end of the day. But I should be failing you even more if I did not tell you of this comforting Christ. 'Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem,' or, as the words are better translated, 'Speak ye home to the heart of Jerusalem.'

It was needed then, that note of comfort: is it not needed now? Think of God looking down at this world to-day, where man at war with man cannot hear the love-song of the angels, God seeing all the pathetic wreckage of broken hopes with which the sea of life is littered, and man's struggles and gropings for the light—what do you imagine God must be feeling, as He contemplates the human scene? Anger? Impatience? Contempt? Disdain? Surely the writer of the old psalm knew better when, out of his own experience of what life and parenthood had taught him, he wrote the words: 'Like as a father pitieth his children, so pitieth the Lord!'

You will remember a poem of Coventry Patmore's—'The Toys,' he calls it—which tells how one day his little son, having been disobedient, was sent to bed unvisited, and how the father, relenting, crept up later that night into the room, and there the child lay asleep, his face still wet with tears; and near his head on a little table he had gathered some of his favourite toys—a box of counters, a few shells, one or two copper coins—to comfort his sad small heart; and as the father kissed those childish tears away and left others of his own, it occurred to him that perhaps God might be feeling towards all His sons and daughters of this world just as he felt that night towards his own sleeping child:

When thou rememberest of what toys
We made our joys,
How weakly understood
Thy great commanded good,
Then, fatherly not less
Than I whom Thou hast moulded from the
clay,
Thou'lt leave Thy wrath, and say,
'I will be sorry for their childishness.'

And surely if ever that was true, it must be true about this wayward, blundering, unhappy world to-day.

But God does not deal with men in the mass, and to talk about God comforting the world may sound

remote and leave us cold. It is the individual message we want to capture. What does this deep saying in Isaiah mean for me? There are souls by the ten thousand needing comfort to-day. Has Advent anything for them?

As one grows older one learns to look at humanity with new eyes of wonder and of reverence; for countless are the hidden heroisms of every day. Take any gathered company of people—think of the troubled spirits that are there among them, baffled and bewildered because life has treated them unkindly, and yet keeping their heads up, and making no complaint; some worried about their health, wondering how long they will be able to keep going, and what will happen to their dear ones when they finally have to give in; men out in the world, bearing the burden and heat of the day, and strained almost to the limit of their endurance by the fierce competition of this modern age; fathers and mothers anxious about children whose characters seem subtly changing, losing something of the frankness and fineness and tenderness that once was there; young people grappling with temptations which they have never been able to tell to any one; lonelinesses that hurt; disabilities that handicap; renunciations that are a crown of thorns; memories that bless, and memories that burn, and memories that are a crucifixion. Try to see them, not with the eyes of cheap criticism, but with the eyes of God—and you will behold there a courage, and a chivalry like the chivalry of Christ.

More than that. You will wish that you could be a helper and a comforter. One feels so helpless often. And one so longs to help. Principal Denney was listening one day to a friend of his own, a missionary from the New Hebrides, telling the graphic story of how one of the New Hebridean islands had received the comfort of the gospel, and had been changed from darkness to light. And when the story was over, 'I'd rather have done a work like that,' said Denney, 'than have written all the best books in the library.'

Have you ever thought how utterly Jesus devoted Himself to this? There are commentators who tell us that Jesus did His miracles of healing to impress the onlookers and to prove His claims. I think not. He did them because He could not bear to see God's children suffering. The great mass of attractive, lovable men and women caught in the toils of sins that spoil their lives, and temptations they could not break, and wild regrets that were a misery—Christ could not bear it. And so He died to free them.

But the greatest thing of all is this, that when

you see this compassionate Christ, you are seeing God. This is the comfort which the Advent tidings bring—and it is all in that one word Immanuel: for Immanuel means 'God with us,' with us in Jesus. The word Immanuel means that where we, with all our poor human words of comfort, break down utterly, God begins. Immanuel means God with you and in you, God making the pain sacrament, the conflict a crusade, and the broken dreams a ladder up to heaven.

But you know and I know that there is one comfort we need more than any other and that is the forgiving of our sins. There is no real comfort until the conscience is at peace, and the heart is clean, and the will is right with God. But the glory of this great word Immanuel is that it means even that. It is not only 'Speak to the heart of Jerusalem,' but 'Cry unto her that her iniquity is pardoned!' 'Cry to her that all is forgiven!'

It is on that level that God's greatest work is done. If on those battlefields where men and women struggle for their souls we have sometimes met defeat; if things have happened and have left a mark, and we know they ought never to have been; if, like those Jews in Babylon, we have felt ourselves exiled from the face of God—then this is the thrill of Advent, to hear the great Father saying, 'My son, My daughter, that is all past now, and done with and finished for ever,' to find every barrier broken down by the love of Christ and the old intimacy restored, to know that you can enter, this very moment, into a new world of light and joy and liberty.

O come, Thou Key of David, come,
And open wide our heavenly home;
Make safe the way that leads on high,
And close the path to misery.

Rejoice! rejoice! Immanuel
Shall come to thee, O Israel.¹

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Advent Gospel and Society.

'Ye turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven.'

—1 Th 1⁹, 10 (R.V.).

'That ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your hands, even as we charged you; that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and may have need of nothing.'—1 Th 4¹¹⁻¹² (R.V.).

'Wait for God's Son from heaven.' 'Study to do your own business.' How are Christians to

¹ J. S. Stewart, *The Gates of New Life*, 190.

combine their hope of heavenly life with the duties of their earthly livelihood? Advent reminds us every year of that problem which has confronted the Christian conscience since the gospel was first preached.

Certainly in the early days it was the heavenly hope which was put first, and constituted the main message of Christianity. The mind of that time was on the whole not at all materialistic, in the modern sense of that word. The political peace and religious toleration established by the Roman Empire did not bring spiritual content. Men grew more and more weary of the changes and chances, the little joy and much unhappiness, which life seemed to offer; and they were often a prey to gloomier fears of spiritual powers which ruled this world and made humanity their plaything. They fashioned for themselves all kinds of obscure mysteries and occult rituals, if by any means they might attain to some standing-ground in eternity, or lay hold on some hope of immortality which would lift them above the one grim certainty of bodily existence.

To those then who accepted it the gospel came as that glorious message from the beyond for which they had so long been vainly groping. Change and decay were not the last words after all. There was One who had risen. And, moreover, the way to partake of the deathless inheritance of His saints was not to belong to any secret society teaching some terrible and hidden knowledge whereby dæmonic powers could be cheated; it was to believe in and follow a loving and human Saviour, and to wait for Him in simple loyalty, until His final triumph should be revealed.

But what of earth meanwhile? As we should have guessed, the Christians were inclined to neglect it and its affairs. This world, and everything in it, was on the verge of dissolution. Let it go. Thus, many of them began to live in a state of exalted idleness, and to cease to take their share in the ordinary work of the world.

But this neglect of what was earthly inevitably did harm to the spiritual and heavenly side of the Christians' life, and marred their very fellowship with Christ. Not occupying themselves with ordinary affairs, they were apt to become restless, excitable, unbalanced, prone to empty talking and to the manifold eccentricities into which those who have lost their anchorage in daily business so readily drift. Hence it comes to pass that in the New Testament, side by side with the glorious gospel of heavenly life and of the unimportance of all earthly things, we find passages which teach a different

lesson. Christians must carry on their ordinary work, must not give up useful trades, must not be unproductive, or become busybodies or parasites on the community.

Christianity still has the same double message for us in the twentieth century. But we shall not read it aright, unless we perceive the great difference in outlook between the ancient world and the modern. More and more we tend to believe that this world, if only its affairs could be better organized either by social reform or by revolution or by a wise conservatism, would be found to contain in itself all the satisfaction which human aspirations can legitimately demand. Instead of disparaging this world as incurably tainted with evil, we disparage the other world as altogether visionary and unreal.

We have set up an enormously complicated structure of industrial civilization which seizes our energies and almost drives them to find their chief aim in the affairs of a material livelihood. Science meanwhile gives to those who possess material wealth the enjoyment of a power of which our ancestors never dreamed; so that we may forget our spiritual slavery in visions of an ever-extending sovereignty over earth. And yet even so we are not allowed to be comfortable. For men when they have ceased to believe in God cannot believe in each other; and not believing in each other, they destroy, through striving with each other, the very wealth for which they strive.

The history of modern civilization seems likely to furnish a grim commentary on the text, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.'

But what is the real value to us of the other-worldly message which Advent brings? What does it mean to wait for the coming of the Lord? Few of us to-day take literally the expectation that the Lord will one day descend from heaven with the sound of a trumpet. And even if we did, what difference precisely should it make to us now?

One meaning of the message is this. The love of God manifested in Christ is the strongest power in the universe. To speak of that power as God's love means that it had not its source in space or time or what we call evolution; nor will it have its end when the earth's course is run. It springs from the eternal being of God Himself, and therefore, whatever happens on this little planet of ours, it is triumphant, triumphant perhaps even through that quality of self-sacrifice which our experience shows us to be its most effective weapon. Whoever takes that love as the guide of his soul has at his back the power which made the world and will complete it.

That is an other-worldly message, but it is a message which is intensely practical.

Our confidence can only escape make-believe, it can only be clear-sighted and strong enough to endure, if it is a confidence founded on God and willing, even in great tribulation, to wait for the power of His love to bring good out of evil in its own most wonderful way. Just in proportion as

we have God's love in our souls, we do more than wait, we make ready the way for the victorious advent of His Son. And as we study to do our own business by the help of that love, we take our tiny part in the one great revolution, that which lifts earth to heaven and brings heaven to earth.¹

¹ O. C. Quick, in *British Preachers*, iii. 155.

The Great Digression.

2 Corinthians ii. 14-vii. 4.

BY THE REVEREND J. T. DEAN, D.D., COLDINGHAM.

THE passing from 1 to 2 Corinthians has been compared to the passing from 'the somewhat intricate paths of a carefully laid-out park to the obscurity of a pathless forest.' Paul's Second Epistle has indeed presented many difficulties to expositors, and not the least of these is what has been called 'the Great Digression' (2¹⁴-7⁴).

The key to the understanding of the Epistle as a whole is to be found in 7⁶⁻¹², where we are told that Paul was raised from the depths of dejection and anxiety to the heights of joy. There had grown up a serious misunderstanding between the Apostle and the Corinthian Church, and relations had become strained. Paul had sent a letter of expostulation to them, and he awaited the reply to that letter with the greatest anxiety. So uneasy was he that he left Troas where there was much work to be done and went across to Macedonia that he might meet Titus the sooner. At length Titus arrived and brought a favourable answer. It showed that the Corinthians had come to themselves, and were sincerely repentant of their treatment of Paul, and were now as eager that he should come to them as they had previously been that he should stay away. It was this answer that made such a change in the condition of the Apostle's mind; and immediately he wrote a letter to the Corinthians, expressing his gladness at the comfort with which God had comforted him. In this letter of reconciliation he recounts *in order* the stages of the quarrel so far as it was necessary to do so in order to put the new friendship on a sure footing. And one of the stages is the letter of expostulation that he had written, the answer to which filled him with so great joy.

It may be claimed that an increasing number of students are coming to the conclusion that the letter of expostulation is to be found, in part at least, in chs. 10-13. The contents of these chapters certainly agree with what Paul himself says about the letter. It was written in sore distress and misery of heart, with many a tear. Some of its statements were so severe that he afterwards regretted having written them, doubting whether they would have the desired effect of softening the hearts of the Corinthians towards him, or of still further increasing their hostility. The purpose of the letter was to awaken the love which he was sure they cherished for him in their hearts, and which had been overlaid by the slanders of opponents. All this is true of these chapters. One can conceive that they might have one of two effects, either to bring out the deep-lying love of their hearts towards him, or to harden them against him. Hence his great joy that their love for him had been made clear to themselves. It may almost be taken for granted that chs. 10-13 are part of the letter of defence. In what other place in all the relations of Paul and the Corinthians could they be put?

But it is with the so-called 'Great Digression' that this paper has to do, and its contention is that it too is part of the letter of defence, which somehow has found its way into the letter of reconciliation.

Its presence in that letter has usually been explained by the fact that it is not unusual for Paul to fly off at a tangent from the direct line of his thought, and to return again to the point from which he digressed. But it is not usual for him to take so lengthy a flight, and perhaps he hardly

ever returns to exactly the same point at which he diverged. It is difficult to believe that 7⁵ did not immediately follow 2¹³ in the original letter. Besides Paul would feel that the Corinthians would be as eager to know whether their submission was satisfying to him as he was to learn that they had come to themselves. Indeed if the 'Great Digression' is removed, the letter of reconciliation becomes what we should suppose a letter of reconciliation would be—short, reserved with regard to what would recall the sad situation, referring to details only in so far as it was necessary to do so in order to ensure that future relations should rest on a clear and firm foundation.

But there are positive arguments for regarding this long section as part of the letter of defence.

1. We take the change that came over Paul's feelings towards the Corinthians on the arrival of Titus as our guide in determining what Paul wrote before, and what after that event. When a person is in grief, or is defending himself against opponents, he does not write as when his heart is filled with joy or when victory has been gained. The letter of reconciliation would be one of undiluted joy, and it is evident that chs. 10-13 manifest anxiety, and contending for the loyalty of the Corinthians, and defence of his apostleship against those who denied it. They have been called Paul's *Apologia*.

Now it is plain that chs. 2¹⁴-7⁴ also were written on the bleak side of his experience. He is still on his defence. He is still contending for the hearts of his converts that have been alienated. He has the same opponents in view. He uses with regard to them the contemptuous 'some people' which we have in 10-13 (3¹). He repudiates their methods. He is not as most who adulterate the Word of God. He renounces the practices which very shame conceals from view. He contrasts the sincerity of his ministry with the falsity of theirs. Plainly he is striving, as in chs. 10-13, to deliver the Corinthians from the wiles of false teachers.

But if chs. 2¹⁴-7⁴ be removed from their present position, the letter of reconciliation makes no mention of opponents. For Paul they have passed out of sight. They have been overcome. They are no longer existent. The Corinthians have been delivered from them. And Paul writes to his friends in perfect joy of reconciliation, with no other between.

2. But the section 2¹⁴-7⁴ agrees with 10-13 in that the Apostle insists in it that it is no personal victory that he seeks, but the good of his converts. Over and over again (3¹ 4³ 5¹ 6⁴) he repudiates the desire to commend himself. He does not need to

carry about letters of recommendation; the existence of the Corinthian Church and its members are his letter of recommendation. He does not feel himself qualified to make any judgment of his own. It is God who has chosen him. This is entirely in agreement with the position that he takes up in 10-13. All that he is, all that happens to him, is for their sakes.

3. But a still stronger argument is that this section is necessary to the completeness of 10-13. In that passage Paul is defending his apostleship, and to some extent, for one writing a letter under deep feeling does not make sharp distinctions, his ministry. But it was not his apostleship and his ministry alone that were impugned. More important still to him was it that the truth of his gospel had been denied. 'Interlopers' had come among them and preached 'a second Jesus' (not the Jesus that he had preached), and treated them to a Spirit different from the Spirit they had once received, and to a different gospel from what he gave them (11⁴).

Now these chapters contain a defence of the gospel that he preached rather than a sustained exposition of it. We get a clear view of those opponents of his in the accusations that they brought against his gospel and his answers to them. They contrasted Paul's gospel with the dispensation of Moses which had been given so gloriously; but he, while admitting the glory of Sinai, shows that it was a glory that had begun to fade from the very first, as shown by the fact that Moses veiled his face that the Israelites might not see the departing of the glory. The glory had been done away in Christ. They had the meanness to mock at his personal appearance and his frail body. 'Yes,' he replies, 'my body is a frail vessel of earth, but that only shows that the power of the gospel which I preach is not of men but of God.' It is the same argument that he used with regard to his 'thorn in the flesh,' that through his weakness God's power was manifested. They said that his gospel was a facile gospel, welcome to men who were reluctant to undergo the discipline of the law. 'Yes,' he answers, 'but it is the gospel of God, that One has died for all, and that in Him all have died, that men might live no longer for themselves, but for Him who died for them and rose again.' It was a ministry, not of obedience to law, but of reconciliation, urging men to righteousness. Such was the defence of the gospel that had been given to him to preach.

4. By a swift turn of thought he glides (cf. 1 Co 1¹⁷ 9²³) into another phase of his defence, namely, of his ministry. It is this ministry that God has

committed to him. He is an envoy for Christ. And he claims that he fulfils this ministry in such a way as to put no obstacles in the path of any (6⁸). He shows himself a true servant of God by endurance of hardship, by purity of character, by courage in defending the Word of God, and by attacking its enemies; amid all the accusations that men might bring against him, he still gains the victory. In this passage of lofty eloquence we have what is in part a condensation of the account of his sufferings for Christ's sake, but expanded to meet the particular charges against his ministry.

What more can he say? What more can he do than lay bare all his heart and plead for their affection? In a passage unequalled for tenderness and pathos he pleads with them. 'O Corinthians, I am keeping nothing back from you; my heart is wide open for you. "Restraint?"—that lies with you not me. A fair exchange now, as the children say. Open your hearts wide to me.¹ . . . Make a place for me in your hearts; I have wronged no one, ruined no one, taken advantage of no one.

'I am not saying this to condemn you. Condemn you? Why, I repeat, you are in my very heart, and you will be there in death and life alike. I have absolute confidence in you, I am indeed proud of you, you are a perfect comfort to me, I am overflowing with delight, for all the trouble I have had to bear.'

Surely in this passage Paul is still striving for their love and confidence. He has still to win them back to loyalty. The storm has not yet sunk into a calm. We are yet at his letter of defence.

Is there any part of 10-13 to which this section may be suitably attached? There seems to be a quite natural connexion with 12²¹ if we remember that Paul was sometimes downcast when he regarded the actual state of affairs. In that verse he is looking upon the condition of the Church in Corinth; and it comes into his mind that all his defence may be in vain, that when he comes to Corinth he may find the Church there in a woeful condition, steeped in heathen impurity and unrepentant of their sins. He fears that God may again humiliate him before them. It was not unnatural that Paul should have such a mood of depression in face of the condition of the Corinthian Church. But it was not in him to cherish such a mood for long, for he had an unfailing antidote to it. Even

¹ It is to be noted that in quoting 2¹⁴-7⁴, 6¹⁴-7¹ is to be omitted, as breaking in with a severely ethical passage upon an utterance of tenderest emotion. As Dr. Moffatt says, 'It belongs to some other part of Paul's correspondence with the Corinthian Church.'

if he had successfully vindicated his apostleship, that might not be sufficient to work the desired change. But as he remembered the gospel that God had given him to preach, and all that the gospel had done through his weakness, he rises triumphant by a leap of faith. 'Humiliate me before you! perish the thought. Thanks be to God, wherever I go He makes my life a constant pageant of triumph in Christ, diffusing the perfume of His knowledge everywhere in me. I carry about with me the fragrance of Christ. It is true that to some it is a deadly perfume, working death, but to those that are being saved it works for life.' In this passage we have a note that runs through the whole of the section, of confidence in the truth of the gospel, of frankness and boldness in the preaching of it, and of strength of heart in believing it (3⁴, 12 4¹, 6). Never again is he downcast.

Conclusion of the letter.

We can well believe that after the outburst of emotion the Apostle had to pause for a while to regain composure, and that he would resume on a less elevated strain. Little more needed to be said. He was coming to pay them a third visit, and it would be a visit of judgment. He warns them to put themselves to the test whether they are in the faith. He is writing to them in absence so that when he comes he may not have to deal sharply with them (cf. 10²). But even for that he has Christ's authority, given to build them up, not to demolish them (10⁸).

Perhaps this was one of the passages that he regretted that he had not put differently, especially as it would be the closing portion of the letter, and might lessen the impression of his tender appeal.

The strongest argument for the unity of the Epistle is that it has come down so from the earliest time. There is no MS., no version, in which the Epistle does not appear as we have it in our Bible. This argument is strong against any tampering with the Epistle, and it has to be faced.

First, note should be taken of the fact that there is no mention in the Acts of the Apostles that there ever was any misunderstanding between Paul and the Corinthian Church. And naturally so; for the incident, grave as it was to Paul, was temporary, and did not affect the history of the Church as a whole.

And now that it had come to an end so satisfactorily, Paul, and not less the Corinthians, would not wish that it should be held in memory. They would want to forget the whole matter. And the

best way to attain that object would be to destroy the letters that had arisen out of it. But Paul's letter, apart from its immediate purpose, was of too great value to the Church of Corinth to be allowed to pass out of use. It contained so clear a presentation of the gospel, and of the hopes of the Christian, especially in chs. 3-6, that the Corinthians would wish to have these chapters retained to be read in the public assembly. We should not wonder then, if, with the consent of Paul, or even with his assistance, this great section was taken out of its place and put where it would be read over and over again. In this sense it is a digression, but one that was made afterwards, in order that its teaching might be preserved and kept to the front. And after ages recognize the truth of the instinct that preserved so rich a document. The details of Paul's sufferings are interesting biographically as showing what a devoted servant of Christ he was, and the Church would have been poorer had they been lost. But they would never have been known had he not been compelled to undertake the unwelcome task of recounting them in defence of his apostle-

ship. But chs. 3-6 are of permanent value in that they set forth the spirituality of the Christian life, the sureness of the Christian hope, and the simplicity of the Christian gospel. For here Paul states the gospel in its simplest form, that in Christ God was reconciling the world to Himself, not counting men's transgressions against them.

There are difficulties that beset any scheme that breaks up an epistle, regarding which we have no evidence that it ever existed in any form or order other than that in which it has come down to us. There are enhanced difficulties in accepting such a dislocation of an epistle as is contended for in this paper. But these difficulties are formal, and cannot stand against the internal evidence of the document. Moreover the solution of the problem here proposed has the merit of helping to make clear the whole situation. But surely the strongest argument of all is that no formal difficulty is at all comparable with the difficulty of believing that a man like Paul could write an epistle regarding which it can be said, after nearly 2000 years of study that it is an 'untracked forest.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

IN the *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* (pp. 151-176) Serge Besobrasoff, the archimandrite Cassien, who is Professor at the Russian College in Paris, prints an acute, critical study of Jn 20¹⁹⁻²³ in connexion with the story of Pentecost in Ac 2¹⁻⁴³. It is only an instalment; the positive reconstruction is to follow. But the Eastern theologian paves the way for this by laying down the thesis that it is not enough to posit the differences between the two stories, as traditional orthodoxy does, and that, on the other hand, the liberal hypothesis, that the Johannine story is merely a symbolic equivalent for the Pentecost of Acts, does not do full justice to the historical data of the former. He gives reasons for setting aside explanations of the Johannine story such as those which regard the gift of the Spirit as potential rather than actual, or as futuristic, though both go back to early patristic theology. Also he recognizes frankly that there seems to be a contradiction between Luke and John at this point, since, according to the former, Jesus appeared

thrice to the disciples during the twenty-four hours following the Resurrection, while in John He only appeared once. It is in the light of such data that the author promises to work out an explanation of the passage.

The notable advance of French criticism to a foremost place on the Continent is admirably illustrated by Professor Jean Héring's recent monograph on 'Le Royaume de Dieu et sa venue; étude sur l'Espérance de Jesus et de l'Apôtre Paul.' The Strasbourg scholar's thesis is subjected to criticism by a younger scholar, the Swiss Dr. Philippe H. Menoud, in a searching paper on 'Le Royaume de Dieu' in the *Lausanne Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* (pp. 118-127). He doubts whether it is fair to regard as an interpolation the description of the Son of Man in the Enochic Parables as 'Messiah,' offers some telling arguments to prove that in the synoptic record 'Son of Man' had a certain messianic significance on the lips of Jesus, and considers that the fusion of the two concepts is much more likely to have been due to Jesus Himself than

to some later tendency in the Apostolic churches ; it is rooted in His idea of God's saving purpose and in His own references to Himself as the divine agent, speaking and acting with authority. Dr. Menoud's points are excellently taken. His brief article is a real contribution to the problem which Professor Héring has so cogently restated.

Some not unjust persons are beginning to be tired and impatient of the term ' crisis ' in contemporary theology. It is ambiguous, it is even misleading, as Professor Beth himself admits, in this brief pamphlet,¹ a reprint of lectures delivered at Berlin. He will not understand it as a peril to Protestantism, but rather as a phase of growth, with tension and strain, within Protestantism itself, and consequently he declines to be pessimistic. The addresses are thoughtful analyses of individualism as an assertion of personal religion, in face of a gracious God, and of the Church-principle involved. Professor Beth is not prepared to follow Barth's lead to the uttermost, gladly as he maintains that for Protestant Christianity the Church is the Church under the Cross, disclaiming merits and glorifying grace. The situation which he has in view is German, which explains a curious appeal to the German mystics as heralds of an Aryan German conception of religion. But, even for outsiders who have no reason to fall back on Aryan mythology, these serious-minded addresses have occasionally suggestions of profit about the genius of the Protestant faith in its German nexus. As, when the author beseeches his fellow-countrymen to read and re-read Luther's treatise on Christian Freedom.

This² is the first part of what promises to be an excellent and timely monograph, the work of a scholar who is alive to the need of bridging the gulf between technical study of theology in the universities and service of the German churches. Dr. Fendt may be described as a liberal Lutheran. He combines critical methods with religious sympathy, and he can write freshly, as those know who have worked with his ' Alten Perikopen ' in Lietzmann's New Testament Handbook.

Much of this book belongs to what is known in our country as Pastoral Theology, though not, as

he points out, in the Roman Catholic usage of the term. He would prefer to define his subject as the theological theory which investigates Church practice as implicit in the New Testament and as relevant to the present situation. It is not a study of ethics or applied Christianity as such, but rather drawn up on the lines laid down by Schleiermacher, who, over a century ago, distinguished philosophical theology and historical theology (including exegesis, church history, dogmatic, ethics, etc.) from the practical theology which is concerned with the activities of the Church. A concise account of ' Church ' in the New Testament is followed by a sketch of Church-offices and especially of homiletics or preaching as a primary function of the ministry. English readers are familiar with the data. But even they will find some suggestive hints in Dr. Fendt's capital outline, especially on the duty and the dangers of topical preaching, which, as he admits, has turned aside in Germany from the expository preaching which Schleiermacher had popularized. One point which he argues boldly is that, while the heart of true preaching lies in the proclamation of God's revelation in Jesus Christ, this must be alive with the spirit of worship, that is, operative in a church, not in an audience. Incidentally he presses German students to use Luther's version as their equivalent for the Latin Vulgate, enshrining the Word of God, in which, together with the Sacraments, the living Church is both visible and vital.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

This book³ has an interest and value which cannot be measured by its size. The author took an active part as translator in the Lausanne Conference ; he is now affirming an exclusive Lutheranism, refusing intercommunion with the Reformed Churches on account of their unsound views on the Lord's Supper. The account he gives of the condition of Western Christendom, even if we were to confine it to Germany, would be distressing if it were impartial, but shows the divisions in German Protestantism as a hindrance to the common witness of the Confessional Church to the common gospel. The exposition given of the meaning of the Lord's Supper in section 7, ' This is my body,' will be of special attraction to those who are not familiar with the Lutheran's doctrine of consubstantiation, and want to understand it, although

³ *Kirche und Herrenmahl*, von Hermann Sasse (Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München; ss. 79).

¹ *Die Krisis des Protestantismus*, by Karl Beth, D.Theol., Dr. Phil. (Kransverlag, Berlin, 1938).

² *Grundriss der Praktischen Theologie für Studenten und Kandidaten*, Erste Abteilung, Grundlegung, Lehre von der Kirche, vom Amt und von der Predigt; by Leonard Fendt, Professor der Theologie an der Universität Berlin (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1938 ; M.3.90).

by no means would all Lutheran theologians accept the author's exegesis or metaphysics.

After indicating in section 1 the prominence and the importance which *the question of the Church* has assumed in recent years, the author in section 2, on the 'Lord's Supper, the Church, and the World,' attributes the secularization of the Church to the depreciation and the neglect of the Lord's Supper, as in his judgment the condition of the Church depends on the place given in its thought and life to this sacrament. With his insistence on the historical character of the Christian religion in dealing with the Supper as 'in memory of me' in section 3 there can be only cordial agreement, so also with his assertion of its redemptive efficiency 'for the forgiveness of sins' in section 4. Section 5, 'Maranatha,' gives a more literalist and dogmatic exposition of the Lord's Second Advent than many Christians who do cherish the hope of the triumph of Christ on earth would now be prepared to accept in view of the transformation of the inherited Jewish eschatology which has already begun in the New Testament and the light which modern scholarship has thrown on apocalyptic literature. In section 6, 'Sanctorum Communio,' the author reminds us of a too much neglected truth, the fellowship of believers in Christ, by many realized most intensely at the Lord's Table; but I cannot follow him when he regards that fellowship as exclusively dependent on the sacraments, and the literal and not figurative meaning of the words: 'This is my body.' He declares, 'It is not theological speculation, but unambiguous teaching of the New Testament that the believers as they celebrate the Lord's Supper, become *one* body, and that this body of the Church becomes the body of Christ. To belong to the Church means to be a member of the body of Christ, to be embodied in Christ. This embodiment takes place in the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper in a way which we cannot at all contemplate or represent' (p. 42). An exposition is given of this doctrine in section 7. Our Lord's words are taken literally, so is Paul's teaching about the body of Christ. The whole Christ as body and soul is present in, with, and under the elements; and the whole believer is, in partaking, united body and soul to Christ. Thus and thus only is our salvation in Him complete. This interpretation is very confidently affirmed as the only possibly true, and the falsehood of any other unhesitatingly asserted. The Society of Friends is charged with *sin* in not observing the ordinance; and intercommunion is refused to those who do not hold this doctrine. The author

seems to me to ignore the fact that our Lord used figurative language in His teaching, and that we may demand more convincing argument than he offers for turning metaphor into dogma. His metaphysics no more command my assent than does his exegesis. I believe with all my mind and heart in the Real Presence of Christ in the sacrament, and the communication of His grace to receptive faith; but I do not feel any need to base that experience on any metaphysics about His body. I regret, with all respect to the Society of Friends, that it severs itself from the rest of Christendom in its attitude to the sacraments and, still more, their neglect by Christians whose practice is not based on principle. I, therefore, sympathize with the author's appeal in section 8 for *the preservation of the Lord's Supper*, but cannot endorse his extravagant language: 'there is no church without the Lord's Supper' (p. 70); 'the Church dies with the Lord's Supper' (p. 74). As a true Lutheran he insists on the need of the gospel as well as of the sacraments. Let me end in hearty agreement, despite all differences, with his closing sentence: 'Word and Sacrament, Gospel and Lord's Supper belong indissolubly together, because Christ the Lord is present in them and through them—not by the Word alone and not by the Sacrament alone, but through both builds His Church in Divine omnipotence and love' (p. 79).

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

VOLUME I of this important work,¹ published in 1935, discussed the nature of dogmatics, then passed, by way of Kant, Hegel, Schleiermacher, and the Dutch 'modern Fathers,' to a searching but generous criticism of contemporary liberal theology, as exemplified in the Netherlands. This theology, standing in positive relationship to culture, sensitive to the light of a new age, earnest for truth, had yet failed even to mark out the proper starting-point for an adequate dogmatic. A sound dogmatic, vital to a sound theology, could only be built upon the foundation of faith and revelation, to which task liberal theology had paid too scant attention.

To Dr. Heering this conclusion presented itself as an urgent challenge. Volume II consists largely of systematic studies of the Biblical, Catholic, and Protestant conceptions of 'faith' and of 'revela-

¹ *Geloof en Openbaring*, II. Richtlijnen voor een Dogmatiek op den grondslag van Evangelie en Reformatie, by Dr. G. J. Heering (Van Loghum Slaterus, Arnhem; Fl. 4.90 and 5.90).

tion,' with one section given to a similar study of 'the gospel.' Two chapters of absorbing interest treat the doctrines of God and man. Heering shares with Reformers and Barthians alike a profound sense of the glory of God—of God historically revealed—and wonder at the divine initiative, yet finds them far astray in their contempt for man, himself made in God's image. On the same theme, Dr. Selbie has written recently in 'The Christian World': 'If we look at the matter from the side of God, it is surely possible for the infinite and eternal God to make himself known through the medium of a human personality. The long story of God's revealing of Himself through saints and prophets and in the Person of Jesus Christ justifies the interpretation of human nature as *finitum capax infiniti*.' Heering would surely endorse these words.

Next he discusses the place of the Christian knowledge of God in a general philosophy, and, finally, indicates guiding principles for formulating a sound dogmatic. He does not attempt to impose a dogmatic system, still less a detailed theology, but rather summons us back to the only sure foundations, makes their nature very clear and suggests to us the consequence.

As usual, Professor Heering displays his mastery of lucid exposition, even when stating views he himself finds untenable, together with a deep scholarship and an impassioned concern for the Word of God. Coming in these days of revived interest in Revelation, this book is timely and vital. It merits a wider public outside Holland than it can find in its present form.

J. WILFRED THOMPSON.

Church Stretton.

Contributions and Comments.

Hebrew 'al ('high one') as a Divine Title.

Ruben (in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, xi. 446) has the credit of being the first to detect and Nyberg (in *Studien zum Hoseabach* 57–60, 89) has also independently recognized that על¹ is probably a divine title in על לא על, 'שובו לא על', which must then be corrected to על שובו אל על, 'they return to the high one' (Hos 7¹⁶). Nyberg has further discovered this same term in אבל עליו עמו, which he alters to אבל על ועמו, 'the high one and his people did mourn' (Hos 10⁵), and in ואל על יקראו, which he alters (taking הו with the following words) to ואל על יקרא, 'and to the high one he cries' (Hos 11⁷). In these three passages על will be an old title for Ba'al, which fell into disuse at an early date in Israel owing to its heathen associations.

Nyberg moreover claims that it recurs in late Hebrew poetry, where its original application has been forgotten. Thus he finds it in חסדי יהוה אביר, 'This

על יהוה בעל, 'I will make mention of the loving kindness of Yahweh; the praises of Yahweh (are) like (those of) the high one' (Is 63⁷), where clearly 'al is still regarded as in some way distinct from Yahweh; here the new interpretation has the effect of restoring both the rhythmical balance and the sense of the verse, since כל אשר נמלנו יהוה, 'לביית ישראל' becomes a clause in apposition to תהלות יהוה, which it defines. Lastly, he finds the same term in יהוה יחתו מריבו עלו בשמים ירעם, where he reads בשמים ירעם, 'יהוה יחתו מריבו ועל בשמים ירעם' (as for) Yahweh, may those who strive with Him be terrified and may the High One thunder in heaven' (1 S 2¹⁰), where Yahweh and 'al are identified in the parallelism of the thought.

Two other passages may be added to those cited by Ruben and Nyberg. If בעל גמלות בעל ישלם חמה, 'לצריו גמול לאיביו לאיים גמול ישלם' is altered (by the excision of obvious doublets and glosses)² to בעל גמלות ישלם | חמה לצריו ולאיביו, 'like the high one will He pay full recompense, fury to His adversaries

¹ This על, 'high one,' is identical with the Hebr. על, 'upper part,' as seen in סעל, 'above,' an old poetic variant of סעל, 'above,' and the Aram. על as seen in סן ארעא עד עלא, 'from earth to sky' = 'from below to above' (Cowley, *Aram. Pap.* v. 5, 11); and the Arab. 'al, 'upper part,' is similarly formed.

² This must be read not as רבשכ, 'abundant in goodness,' but as רבשכ, 'abundance of goodness' (as by Symm. and Jer. in the Vulg.; cf. Pesh. and Targ.).

³ Cf. LXX's ὡς ἀνταποδοῦναι ἀνταποδοῦναι δεινός τοῖς ὑπεραντίοις, which too shows a line without much of the repetition found in the present M.T.

and to His enemies' (Is 59¹⁸), both rhythm and meaning are again recovered; the cause of the confusion must clearly have been the mysterious כַּעַל, which upset the copyists and led them to make various attempts to obtain an intelligible sense. The argument is finally clinched by הַנָּכַר הָקֵם עָלָי, for which the LXX (B) have ἀνὴρ ὃν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός, i.e. הַנָּכַר הָקֵם עָלָי, 'the man whom the High One raised up' (2 S 23¹), which is then parallel with the following מִשִּׁיחַ אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב. Thus the existence of a Hebr. עָל as a divine title, which in several passages is suggested by the rhythm of the verse and the parallelism of the thought, is confirmed by the most ancient of the versions.

Ruben (*l.c.*) further cites such a name as the Phoen. בִּרְכַעַל, usually wrongly explained as a mistake for בִּרְכַבַּעַל (cf. Schröder, *Phön. Spr.* 130⁹, 324-325), to which בַּחוּעַל (cf. Hebr. בַּחוּאֵל) may be added. Ought then the Hebr. מְרִיבָעַל and perhaps מְרִיבָעַל, to be read respectively יִרְבַּעַל (cf. Hebr. יִרְבָּעַם) and מְרִיבַעַל (cf. Nab. מְקִימַאֵל), which the variant מְרִיבַעַל (1 Chron. 8⁴⁰) and מְרִבַּעַל (Diringer *Iscrizioni* 23) support?

Note.—In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlix. 37, I suggested that וּמַחֲמוֹטִים כַּמַּסְעָרָה אֹוִי (Sir. 33²) means 'and tossed about as a ship by a storm,' following the Greek ὡς ἐν καταγυῖνι πλοῖον. On this interpretation, however, the order of the words is peculiar, and either it must be accepted as an example of incorrect grammar or the last two words must be regarded as having been erroneously translated by a copyist and be corrected to כַּמַּסְעָרָה אֹוִי, 'as a ship by a storm.'

G. R. DRIVER.

Oxford.

St. Mark iv. 45.

In none of the Commentaries that I have been able to consult have I been able to find the full force of the Greek verb, κατεφίλησε, in Mk 14⁴⁵ satisfactorily brought out. C. H. Turner in Gore's Commentary criticises the R. V. 'Kissed him much,' and suggests that it is a case in which the compound verb in later Greek has lost the special force of the preposition. Montefiore says 'it is a little difficult that this sign was necessary in the case of a man who had been prominently teaching in Jerusalem for some while,' and he regards the whole incident with suspicion. Others point out that it is the ordinary salute with which the pupil used to greet

his Rabbi. Swete on the other hand argues that the proper force of the compound verb is apparent in N.T. usage and quotes Lk 7³⁸ 15²⁰, Ac 20³⁷, but even then he does not suggest what the word implies in this passage. It is obvious that the father did not content himself with imprinting a kiss on the prodigal son's forehead, nor the woman that was a sinner on our Lord's feet, nor the elders on the neck of the departing apostle. Judas has bidden the Sanhedrists 'seize and carry Him off securely.' He is afraid that in the dark and the confusion that may be caused with the band of eleven apostles round Jesus He might yet manage to escape whilst He is being identified. He cannot bring himself violently to seize Jesus. And so with guile he goes up to Him as a friend, and puts his arms round Him kissing Him ardently, thus not only identifying Him but making it impossible for Him to escape without a struggle. The kiss is not a merely gratuitous addition to the treachery, but part of the deep-laid scheme to prevent the escape of Jesus, and the compound verb used only in St. Mark's Gospel must be given its full force.

P. B. EMMET.

Nandyal, R. S., South India.

John iv. 44.

It seems to me obvious that by the phrase 'his own country' the Fourth Evangelist means Galilee in contrast with Judæa. Hence in 4⁴⁵, on a later return to Galilee, we are told that the Galileans *now* received Him because they had been at Jerusalem at Passover and were impressed by what they had seen of Christ there. And so their natural prejudice as men of His own country was overcome.

Mr. Wordsworth misapprehends me as to the sequence of the narrative owing to my note being all too brief fully to discuss this point. But my suggestion is not that ch. 1 is followed by 3^{22f.}. The order of the 'pages' is, I believe, as follows: 1⁴⁰⁻⁵³; 4¹⁻¹⁸; 4¹⁷⁻²⁹; 4³⁰⁻⁴² (but v. 30 is, I think, displaced from its true position after v. 39); 4⁴³, 2¹⁻¹², 4⁴⁴; 2¹³⁻²⁵; 3²²⁻³⁶; 4¹⁻³. 45-54.

The page 3¹⁻¹³ might perhaps follow upon 2¹³⁻²⁵, but it may more probably, I think, come in a later connexion. Anyhow, 3¹⁴⁻²¹ certainly belongs elsewhere. It links up with 12³⁴⁻³⁶ to make a page in sequence to 12²⁰⁻³³. It is apparently the intrusion of the gloss 12³³ which has caused the dislocation of 3¹⁴⁻²¹, since it interrupts the sequence of Christ's speech of which 3¹⁴⁻²¹ is the latter part. It is to

be noted that while 12³⁴, 'the *Son of Man* must be lifted up,' does *not* accurately answer to 12³²: 'I, if I be lifted up'; it does answer with strict accuracy to 3^{14f}.

LEWIS JOHNSON.

Bristol.

1 Samuel xiii. 1.

IN the course of an interesting note on the Hebrew text of this verse Professor Driver notes 'No doubt in the words בן שנה שאול the number denoting Saul's age was originally intended to have a place between בן and שנה, although, for some reason, the

text as it stands is deficient. Three or four MSS. of LXX read νῆς τριάκοντα ἔτων; but in view of the age at which Jonathan, almost immediately after Saul's accession, appears, a higher figure seems to be required.' May not the original be בן שנה ושלושים שנה שאול במלכו, the similarity of the second and fourth words having resulted in the second and third words falling out or in the survival of the third word only? Even if it is a late insertion it would be well to have it in its correct form. Possibly if it be a marginal note, the abbreviation 'for final α might be tolerated through lack of space for ς, and then be overlooked.

F. J. BRIGGS.

Barbados.

Entre Nous.

The Greatest Idea.

'Europe to-day supplies vivid illustrations of the way in which ideas can be used to enthuse or to enslave great peoples. Fascism, Nazism, Communism, and Democracy are ideas, but not one of them has any richness of content compared with that of the idea of the Kingdom of God. Yet leaders have demonstrated what can be done with such ideas. Then what might have been accomplished along those lines with the greatest idea of all?'

This is the question Dr. R. E. Roberts puts in *This Gospel of the Kingdom* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). In a dozen disturbing chapters he applies the Kingdom of God to everyday life, working out the thought of its challenge, its inclusiveness, driving power, counterfeits, passport, and the need of utter loyalty. This is a fine and timely book and eminently readable.

On facing facts, Dr. Roberts writes, 'One of the really lovely things about the Kingdom of God is that it is so hospitable to the common facts of life. . . . It knows nothing of social exclusions, but it knows as little of mental exclusions. It looks at life freely, frankly, and wholly, and is unafraid.'

'Hence it is not surprising that Jesus tells us that the King has gone away. Life really looks like that. . . . I wonder how many people have agreed with Mrs. Beddows in Winifred Holtby's *South Riding* that it is no use appealing to God

in case of emergency because His is a "seat of incommunicable justice"? A very large slice of life seems to be outside the intimate care of God. From these distressed areas of earth the cry goes up "How long?" and Heaven makes no gesture of reply. It is obviously unfair.

'But what if the truth is that the whole of life is forsaken of God? What if that which we thought to be the kindly response of God to our prayer is really nothing more than the abandonment of our smug spirits to a poor petty selfishness, like that of a spoiled child who confuses his good fortune with his deserts.

'It is surprising with what gaiety Jesus accepts the absence of God. His parables, without exception, assume, if they do not expressly state, that God has withdrawn from the management of His Kingdom. He was there in the beginning and He will certainly be there in the end. . . . Jesus is hilarious about the possibilities of this forsaken world. It is here and not in any select classroom that the Kingdom of Heaven is to be found. God may be away from His Kingdom, but it is still His Kingdom.

'Be it said at once that Jesus can outdo the most religious in detecting the presence of God. . . . Yet none is half so brave as He in refusing to see God where He is not. What a contrast to H. G. Wells's *Miracle Man*. Mr. Wells endows his man with the power to interfere with the laws of the universe, but makes him powerless to get inside

people, and his breathless adventures end in a complete fiasco. It seems so easy to produce a new world along those lines, but the experiment shows how impossible it is. Jesus on the other hand refuses to tamper with the works by altering God's arrangement of the universe and decides for the adventure of getting inside men. And here God has left Him and us to do it.'

Relapse into Barbarism.

Mr. Charles Morgan the novelist has now written his first play, *The Flashing Stream*. The theme of it is singleness of mind and he has prefaced it with an essay on that topic. 'This is the meaning of "relapse into barbarism"—an abdication of spiritual powers, a surrender of unique emblems—but even this is not the death of the spirit of Man. A soul is not dead when it ceases to love but when it loses the capacity for love, and man is not lost, however barbarous, while there remains in him the power to wonder, and to feel his way, however blindly, towards a predestined fulfilment. To safeguard and renew this power is the supreme purpose of existence so far as our knowledge and intuition instruct us. We can do no more; the rest must be added unto us; if it is not, life has no meaning but appetite, and we are beasts deceived. We can do no more, in the Christian phrase, than seek God, that, finding Him, we may at last know Him, whom we do not know, and discover the nature of that invincible imagination which drives mankind towards an end that has borrowed His name.'

Autumn.

'It is good to make a fresh start in our daily calling. Many are compelled to do work that is not in itself particularly congenial. It may even be distasteful, and the distaste for it may grow with the years. Oh, to be able to cast it aside and try something else! we may cry in our weariness. . . . Our daily bread must be earned, and we are bound to go on with work that has long ceased to enthral us. What can we do about it?

'Let us make sure that the dullness does not lie in ourselves. Most work has some sort of interest inherent in it if only we have eyes to perceive it.

'In his book, *Thoughts and Adventures*, Mr. Winston Churchill speaks of the advantages of painting as a pastime, and emphasizes the fact that it sharpens the powers of observation: "I was shown a picture of Cézanne of a blank wall of a house, which he had made instinct with the most delicate lights and colours. Now I often amuse

myself when I am looking at a wall or a flat surface of any kind by trying to distinguish all the different colours and tints which can be discerned upon it, and considering whether these arise from reflections or natural hue."

'Your occupation,' comments Mr. Patten, 'may seem like a blank wall—forbidding, uninteresting, without character, but have you learnt to look for the delicate lights and colours that gleam upon it?'¹

Moral Rearmament.

'At times of great crisis people just naturally look to God, and they expect their leaders to give them the lead. In a fateful hour when pronouncements are made, men hope against hope that there will be some force at work that will put off what we all deserve. It is one thing to say that God-control is the only true policy. It is another thing to make it a reality in the life of the nation. A whole new fabric needs to be woven. We cannot live on the past. We must bring in a whole new philosophy of willing and living and acting.

'Moral rearmament is the keynote of world reconstruction. We need the same characteristics that distinguish a great general—the plus of character, the plus that will change the world. We all agree on one thing—that we ought to be different, and that the world ought to be different. If people were different and had the power to change the men and the nations, that would be the answer to all our problems. And that is what the Oxford Group believes.

'Interlaken demonstrates that every man in every land should listen to guidance. For every home in every land the natural and normal thing is to get their programme from God. In industry, in the workshop, in the nation's life, in Parliament, the normal thing is to listen to God. Each nation expresses it in its own way—one nation in one way, and another in another, but all God-controlled and God-led. Thus with God leading, all will understand each other.'²

Glimpses into the Mind of Masaryk.

I have read the most important so-called biographies of Jesus; in none of them do I find so much religious life as in the Gospels. The Gospels have the very smell of reality.

Real faith is not a nail on which one could hang oneself in despair because of the weakness of reason.

¹ John A. Patten, *The Unclouded Face*.

² Dr. Frank Buchman in *The Church of England Newspaper*, September 23, 1938.

Faith, true genuine faith does not lull to sleep, but arouses and drives.

Religion without humanity cannot be true; humanity without religiousness cannot be complete.

The more order in the world is secularized, the more the churches could and should dedicate themselves to a pure and immaculate religion—to Jesus' religion; to make the world truly Christian, not through power but through love.

To progress means to overcome what is evil. Yet to conquer evil by good is not very difficult; the difficulty is to supersede good by better.

Justice is the mathematics of Peace.¹

Samuel Johnson.

Canon Anthony C. Deane was in happy mood at the celebration of the 229th Anniversary of Samuel Johnson's birthday. In the course of his address he asked: 'Were Johnson alive to-day, what would he think of us, and what should we think of Dr. Johnson?' The Canon thought that Johnson would have a very poor opinion of our ordinary talk. Much of our idiom would seem unintelligible to him, and all of it he would think sadly undignified. 'When Johnson said to Boswell, "I shall desire your company, sir, to-morrow forenoon," what would have been his comment had Boswell replied: "That's okay by me, big chief"?' Canon Deane pictured Johnson's reactions to modern aerial warfare, pausing as he paced the garden on some nights when searchlights and aeroplanes were practising. Would he not say: 'The Psalmist, surveying the midnight sky, pronounced with sublime truth that "The heavens declare the glory of God." It has remained for your age, sir, to make them exhibit also the folly of man and the malevolence of the devil.' Whether this be so or not, one thing is certain: Johnson would have no sympathy with the curious modern heresy that everything will come right in the end. 'I remember,' he said, on one occasion, 'that my Maker has said that He will place the sheep on His right hand, and the goats on His left.' That is a solemn truth which this frivolous age needs to hear, for it strikes at the very roots of life and destiny.²

Raj the Dacoit.

The story of Raj, the Robin Hood of the Indians, has been told in one of the Dohnavur books. Now in a large illustrated volume all the adventures of his life have been graphically retold for boys and

girls by Hugh A. Evan Hopkins (Seeley Service; 5s. net). There is a Foreword by T. Howard Somervell—who says it is 'an effective answer' to those who think that Missions are useless. After Raj became a Christian he was deserted by his followers for if he was to cease to rob how were they to live? One companion remained. 'Raj then turned to Chotu, who had been standing silently by, and asked:

"Will you also go away and leave me?"

"I am flesh of the finger-tip to thy finger-nail," was all the young lad had to say, and from that day forward the two were never separated.'

No one could doubt the reality of Raj's conversion. Even the police while trying to capture him said, 'The fact is, and we cannot deny it, he is a changed man.' Raj himself, explaining the change said, 'When I saw the gold and jewels hanging from the women's ears, my fingers twitched to take them [he had met a wedding party travelling by bullock cart] *but my mind refused to desire.*'

Bricks for Wedding Speeches.

My first is Garrick's answer to the Duchess of Kingston's question as to why Cupid was always represented as a child. 'Because,' he said, 'love never attains to years of wisdom and discretion!'

You can evoke another smile, and folk love to smile on such occasions, by telling the story of the American coloured man who asked his sweetheart: 'Does yo' really love me, baby, or does yo' jes' think yo' does?' 'Yes, indeed, honey,' she made answer. 'Ah really loves yo'. Ah ain't done no thinkin' yet!'

Then, when you turn to seriousness—and a speech at a wedding should never be all amusing—you can quote the words of the wise man who was asked whether he and his wife did not have differences of opinion, and answered: 'Faith, ma'am, we have a good many; but I don't let her know about them'; and that fine tribute of Carlyle to his wife, spoken to Lord Houghton: 'She wrapped me round like a cloak, to keep all the hard and cold world off me.'¹

¹ Ezra in *The Methodist Recorder*.

¹ Masaryk on *Thought and Life*.

² *The Record*.